Col 4 Fe

THE

HISTORY

OF THE

ARIANS,

AND OF THE

Council of *NICE,*

Made good by CITATIONS from Original Authors:

WITH A

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE,

CONTAINING

An ABRIDGMENT of the Principal Things in the HISTORY, placed according to the Order of Time; and with NOTES, clearing the Difficulties of Facts and Chronology.

Written in *French* by Mr *De Tillemont:*
And Tranſlated into *Engliſh* by *Thomas Deacon.*

VOL. II.

Recommended by the Rev. Dr *Waterland* in theſe Words; "Tillemont's Hiſtory of the Arians: *a Book which I "would particularly commend to the Peruſal of the* Engliſh "*Readers, to give them a juſt Notion both of the antient and "modern* Arianiſm." Waterland's ſecond Defence of ſome Queries *p.* 302. 2d *Edit.*

LONDON:
Printed for G. STRAHAN, at the *Golden Ball,* againſt the *Royal Exchange,* in *Cornhill.* 1732.

18

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

SECTION CIII.

The deplorable state of the Church at the time of Constantius's death: Julian recalls the Bishops who were banish'd: All the West and a great part of the East declare for the Council of Nice.

[WHEN Constantius the Emperor died, he left the Church in the most deplorable and dangerous condition she could ever be reduc'd to by war from without and by heresy. For the declar'd enemies to the Divinity of Jesus Christ triumph'd every where: The principal Churches were in the hands of the Heads of pure Arianism, as George at Alexandria, Euzoius at Antioch, Eudoxius at Constantinople, Acacius at Cæsarea in Palestine, Germinius at Sirmium, Auxentius at Milan; and the rest were in the possession of those who were of their principles and in their interest, or at least were polluted by joining their communion, and signing the confession drawn up at Nicæ in Thrace, and receiv'd by the Councils of Ariminum and Constantinople. A.D. 362.

S. Athanasius, S. Meletius of Antioch, S. Eusebius of Vercellæ, and all the others who pass'd for defenders of the true faith, were either depos'd and banish'd, or else oblig'd to abscond, to avoid worse usage:] * So that none of the sees of the Church could shew a Bishop, who might be said to preserve the honour and purity of the faith, except perhaps a small number of those whose obscurity conceal'd them from the persecution of the hereticks, [as Gregory of Elvira in Spain, for he is the only one of this kind whom we can give for an example, and we do not know whether he durst appear in his Church. Pope Liberius had fallen, like the rest, in 357; and Vincentius of Capua as early as 353. They had begun to recover themselves from their fall, since we are assur'd that they had no hand in the crime of the Council of Ariminum: and it is likewise be-

* Naz. or. 21. p. 387 c.

A.D. 362. believ'd, that Liberius was at leaſt oblig'd to hide himſelf in the grotts and ſubterraneous vaults which were about Rome. There was only the Biſhops of Gaul, who after having fallen like the reſt at Ariminum, began in all probability to recollect themſelves, [1] animated by S. Hilary, whom God had reſtor'd to them by a kind of miracle, and favour'd by the revolt of Julian againſt Conſtantius. The ſame thing may be believ'd of Spain and England; but there is no proof of it.

[1] See S. Hilary, §. 11, 12.

Hereſy was ſo powerful at that time of day, that it could not ſo much as bear with thoſe who were but moderate hereticks. Macedonius of Conſtantinople, Eleuſius of Cyzicus, Silvanus of Tarſus, Euſtathius of Sebaſtia, and the others who paſs'd for Semiarians, had been depos'd and baniſh'd to divers places. It is true, they had treated Aëtius and Eunomius in the ſame manner, who were the moſt impious in their expreſſions of any of the Arians; but their principles were ſtill embrac'd by Eudoxius, Euzoïus, and the reſt of the ſame party, and their moſt faithful diſciples were publickly rais'd to the rank and authority of Biſhops.]

λ All the earth (to make uſe of S. Jerom's expreſſions) lay ſighing and groaning, ſurpriz'd to ſee itſelf become Arian. [The Church,] the ſhip of the Apoſtles was toſs'd about by theſe furious winds, theſe violent waves beat againſt her on all ſides, ſhe was in danger of being ſhipwreck'd, and no hope was left. But at this moment of time the Lord awakes, he rebukes the ſtorm, the beaſt dies, and tranquillity returns. [For Julian who ſucceeded Conſtantius, [2] having a mind to be reveng'd upon his officers who had done him ſome ill offices, was in reality the miniſter of God to puniſh the Lord Chamberlain Euſebius the eunuch, and the other principal ſupports of Arianiſm.

[2] See Julian, §. 10.

But what was ſtill more advantageous to the Church, was [3] that he recall'd all whom Conſtantius had baniſh'd upon the account of religion.] μ It is eaſy to imagine, that in doing this he had no deſign to reſtore peace to the Church. ν He aim'd at nothing but to get the good will of the people, to make Conſtantius's government odious, ξ or even to deſtroy the Chriſtians by their own diviſions, which he thought would increaſe the more for every body's having the liber-

[3] See the perſecution under Julian, §. 3.

λ Hier. in Lucif. c. 7. p. 143. b. μ Bar. 361. §. 25. ν Socr. l. 3. c. 1. p. 168. a--c. ξ Soz. l. 5. c. 5. p. 601. a. | Amm. l. 22. p. 208, 209. | Chr. Al. p. 688.

ty

ty to defend his own principles, as may be seen by the Heathen as well as Christian authors. [But God, whose wisdom knows how to draw good out of evil, was pleas'd to make his false politicks turn to the ruin of Arianism. For tho' some of the most wicked among the Arians were comprehended in the number of exiles recall'd,] [o] as Aetius [and Eunomius, as well as Photinus the Arch-heretick, yet the Church reap'd the principal advantage.] A.D. 362.

[π] S. Meletius return'd therefore to Antioch; S. Eusebius of Vercellæ and Lucifer of Cagliari came back from the farthest parts of Thebaïs; [S. Cyril was restor'd to the possession of the Church of Jerusalem.] [ρ] Egypt receiv'd her Athanasius as a victorious conqueror, who returns in triumph [after a long war; and this Saint appear'd again upon his throne like a glittering star, or rather like a flash of lightning, for Julian could not bear the brightness of the rays which already darted from him.

S. Athanasius's return did not happen before August, and it was preceded by [4] the death of George the usurper of his see, who having render'd himself no less odious to the Heathens of Alexandria by his base covetousness and tyrannical violences, than he had to the Catholicks by the impiety of his doctrine and the persecution he rais'd against the Orthodox, was massacred by the former with all the marks of the utmost indignity, but which he most richly deserv'd.

[4] See S. Athanasius, §. 93.

As soon as S. Athanasius was return'd to Alexandria, he with several Confessors held a famous Council there, in which we may say he preserv'd the Church by the resolution which he caus'd to be taken, to receive all who had sign'd the Arian confessions as Catholicks and brethren, provided that they renounc'd that communion and embrac'd the Nicene faith. This resolution was unanimously receiv'd by the East and West; except [5] Lucifer, who choosing to be more rigorous in his discipline, proceeded so far as even to separate from those who had more charity than himself, and form'd a new schism which was call'd after his name.

[5] See Lucifer, §. 3.

The world soon saw the effects which God made to flow from the charity of the holy Confessors, and the liberty which Julian allow'd all Christians to maintain their prin-

[o] Juli. ep. 31. p. 164. [π] Thdrt. l. 3. c. 2. p. 639. a, b. | Chr. Al. p. 688. [ρ] Hier. in Lucif. c. 7. p. 143. b.

A.D. 362. ciples, thinking they would ruin themselves by their divisions: And these effects were better than could have been hop'd for. For in no longer space than the following year, and immediately after the death of Julian,] σ S. Athanasius assures Jovian his successor, that the Nicene faith was universally receiv'd by all the Churches of Spain, England, and Gaul, by all Italy, Dalmatia, Dacia, Mysia, and Macedonia, by all Greece, and Africa, by the islands of Sardinia, Cyprus, and Candia, by Pamphylia, Lycia, τ Isauria, Egypt, Libya, Pontus, Cappadocia, and the East [or the Patriarchate of Antioch;] that is by all the earth, excepting a small number of Arians. He declares, that he was assur'd of the faith of all these Churches, both by letters which he had concerning them, [6] and by many other proofs. [7] See §. 83. [We have already seen 7 how much haste the West made to reject the Council of Ariminum, and we shall speak of it again in the sequel.]

[6] πίστεις.

υ S. Athanasius acquaints us again about the year 368, that in the few years in which God had given some liberty to his Church, a great number of Councils had been held, as well in France, in Spain, and at Rome, φ as in Dalmatia, Dardania, Macedonia, Epirus, Greece, Candia, and the other islands, χ in Sicily, Cyprus, Lycia, Isauria, Egypt, and Arabia; to maintain the Catholick faith, ψ and receive no other Council but that of Nice. ω It was astonishing to see the great number of Bishops who sign'd every where, and it was wonderful that there could be any sprig left of that bitter root of Arianism; but if any such appear'd, it was immediately lopt and cut off from the Church.

[In the enumeration which S. Athanasius makes of the provinces which had embrac'd the Nicene faith before the end of 363, he does not mention Thrace, Bithynia, and Hellespont.] α Sozomen says indeed, that in these provinces and some other neighbouring ones, and generally speaking in the greatest part of the Eastern Empire, the Catholicks had neither [8] Bishops nor Churches. β Eudoxius was master of the Churches in Constantinople, and the Catholicks had there, says Socrates, only a little [9] church in the town for their assemblies. γ And if we may believe So-

[8] ἱερέας.

[9] οἰκίσκον.

σ Ath. ad Jov. t. 1. p. 246. d. τ p. 247. a. υ Ath. ad Afr. p. 931. c, d. φ ad Epict. p. 582. a. φ ad Afr. p. 931. d. p. 932. a. ψ ad Epict. p. 582. b. ω ad Afr. p. 932. a. α Soz. l. 6. c. 10. p. 650. a. β Socr. l. 4. c. 1. p. 211. c. γ Soz. l. 6. c. 9. p. 649. a.

zomen,

zomen, they had none at all. δ When S. Basil was numbering up the provinces of the Catholick communion [in 365, he takes no notice of Thrace. Nor does he make any mention of Bithynia, nor Paphlagonia, nor even of Galatia, of which the Arians might become masters in 373, after the death of Athanasius of Ancyra.] A. D. 362.

SECTION CIV.

The Semiarians are re-establish'd in Asia, condemn the pure Arians, and form a new body call'd the Macedonians.

[THE Semiarians return'd likewise from their banishment by vertue of Julian's edict; and this is probably enough the time when that happen'd] ε which S. Basil gives an account of, that as Eustathius of Sebastia was passing through the diocese of Gangra in Paphlagonia in his return from Dardania, he overthrew the altars of Basilides, and built others upon which to offer the Sacrifice.

[As far as we can judge by the course of the history, this Eustathius was restor'd to the possession of his Church, which the Council of Constantinople had depriv'd him of in 360. We must say the same thing of Silvanus of Tarsus, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and many others, whose sees perhaps as yet were not fill'd.] ζ At least we find, [1] that Eleusius was put into prison in Julian's reign, as a destroyer of Paganism in Cyzicus, of which place he was Bishop, says Sozomen.

[1] See the persecution under Julian, §. 7.

[As for those whose Churches were fill'd at that time, we do not know how matters were order'd with them. Athanasius whom the Arians had plac'd at Ancyra in the room of Basil, [2] continued there to the day of his death,] η tho' Basil was alive in Jovian's reign. θ Socrates says, that all these Bishops who were condemn'd in 360, were masters of their Churches in the beginning of Valentinian's

[2] See S. Basil, §. 98.

δ Bas. ep. 75. p. 131. e. ε Bas. ep. 72. p. 118. a. | 73. p. 121. a. ζ Soz. l. 5. c. 15. p. 615. c, d. η Socr. l. 3. c. 25. p. 203. b, c. θ l. 4. c. 1. p. 211. b, c.

reign;

A.D. 360. reign. [There is some probability, that in the places where this difficulty presented, both the contenders took the title of Bishops of the city, and made himself be acknowledg'd as such by those whom he could get to communicate with him.

The Semiarians were not satisfy'd with being restor'd:] ι And as Constantius's death left them at perfect liberty, Eleusius, Eustathius, Sophronius of Pompeiopolis, and the rest of the same party, call'd together those who had been favourable to them in the Council of Seleucia, and held several assemblies among themselves, in which they condemn'd the Acacians together with the confession of Ariminum. But they sign'd again that of Antioch, which declar'd the Son to be like the Father in Substance, boasting by the mouth of Sophronius of Pompeiopolis, that their doctrine kept the middle way between the two extremes of the Westerns, who confounded, said they, the Divine persons by following the Consubstantiality, and the Aëtians who maintain'd the Son to be unlike the Father.

[One of these assemblies of the Semiarians is perhaps that] κ which was held at Zela in Pontus, where S. Basil says Eustathius embrac'd a new faith.

λ It was therefore at this time, and after the death of Constantius, that they began to form a separate body and party [distinct from the communion of the Arians;] and then it was that they likewise began to give them the name of Macedonians, μ because Macedonius who was depos'd [in 360] from the bishoprick of Constantinople, was look'd upon as the head of the sect, ν he having begun to form it immediately after his deposition. [We have seen in another place [3] that it is pretty uncertain, whether they did not reject the sense of the word Consubstantiality, as well as the term itself; but thus far is certain, that they oppos'd the faith of the Church, by denying the Divinity of the Holy Ghost; which made their error at last either capital or singular, especially after the death of Valens, and occasion'd their being call'd Pneumatomaci, that is enemies to the Holy Ghost. I do not know from whence came] ξ the name of Tropici or Changers, which S. Athanasius

[3] See §. 66, 93.

ι Soz. l. 5. c. 14. p. 614. κ Bas. ep. 72. p. 118. e. | Blond. prim. p. 135. λ Soz. l. 5. c. 14. p. 614. b. μ b. | l. 4. c. 26. p. 586. d. ν Socr. l. 2. c. 45. p. 158. c, d. ξ Ath. de Spi. p. 192. a.

gives

gives them in a treatise [written about the end of Constantius's reign. But the course of time shew'd, that it perfectly agreed with some of them, as particularly with Eustathius.] o They were likewise sometimes call'd Marathonians because of Marathonius [Bishop of Nicomedia, of whom we have spoken [4] above,] and without whom it is pretended this sect would soon have been quite extinct at Constantinople. He supported it by his diligence, by his money, π by his pathetical discourses which were polite enough, and by a compos'd countenance and serious behaviour, fit to draw the esteem of the people. A. D. 362.

[4] See §. 62.

ρ These two last qualities were likewise to be met with, according to Sozomen, in many other Chiefs of this sect, as Eleusius [and Eustathius.] They were regular in their morals, grave in their behaviour, very austere in their life, and they pass'd their time pretty much like monks. And as the people lov'd this appearance of piety extremely, they drew many followers after them by this means; and it is observ'd, that Macedonius's party was join'd by a considerable part of the people of Constantinople and the adjacent parts, σ by several monasteries, and by persons most irreproachable in their lives as well of that city as of the neighbouring provinces: τ And they settled several monasteries which were fill'd with a great number of men and young women. υ And indeed S. Gregory Nazianzen bestows great commendations upon the lives and manners of the Macedonians.

φ Sozomen however observes, that after the deposition of Macedonius, [or at least after Valens had declar'd for the Arians,] they had neither Bishop nor Church in Constantinople till the time of Arcadius's being Emperor. χ S. Gregory Nazianzen complains that they boasted of having Bishops who were ordain'd by Eleusius, and he seems to say that this was at Constantinople itself, [but he is not express in this.] ↓ I do not know whether Marathonius did not take the title of Bishop of Constantinople, [after the death of Macedonius.] ω The Macedonians, after their separation from the Arians, had the possession of

o Soz. l. 4. c. 27. p. 586. b, c. π a. | Suid. ελ. p. 877. b, c. ρ Soz. p. 586. a. | Suid. p. 877. c. σ Ruf. l. 1. c. 25. p. 148. τ Suid. p. 877. c. υ Naz. or. 44. p. 710, 711. φ Soz. l. 4. c. 27. p. 586. c. χ Naz. or. 46. p. 721. c. ↓ Suid. p. 877. b. ω Socr. l. 5. c. 9. p. 266.

the

A. D. 362. the Church which Macedonius himself had built there. But from the year 381 it was in the hands of the Catholicks, Theodosius having turn'd the Macedonians out of it, says Socrates, [who in this point is contrary to Sozomen.]

α These hereticks were particularly dispers'd in Thrace, Bithynia, Hellespont, and the countries round about: β But there were more of them in Hellespont than any where else. The city of Cyzicus was full of them; and some pretended miracles are reported to have been wrought by a Macedonian of that city.

γ The Council of Illyricum, [held, as we believe, in 375,] complains that throughout all the diocese of Asia they preach'd and disputed against the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. δ S. Basil in an epistle [written the same year,] speaking of some Bishops of Lycia who had a mind to join his communion, rejoices for that there were at least some in Asia who were not infected with the general distemper of this country and the corruption of the hereticks. ε And in making an enumeration of the provinces that were in his communion [and in that of the Church,] besides all the West, he takes notice of what was right in Egypt, of all the [orthodox] remains in Syria and the neighbouring Armenia, [that is certainly the Less which was subject to the Empire;] to which he adds some provinces of Asia, as Lycaonia, Pisidia, Isauria, and the two Phrygia's. [But he does not mention the Proconsular Asia, nor Pamphylia, Hellespont, Caria, nor the isles.] ζ We see even by the Council of Illyricum, that Phrygia was extremely infected with the heresy of the Macedonians.

η There were likewise some of them in Palestine, whom Melania the Grand-mother and Rufinus brought back to the Church [about the year 380.] θ S. Austin assures us, that there were none of them out of the East.

[With regard to the pure Arians, as their interest diminish'd by the re-establishment of the others,] ι they had recourse to Aëtius, according to Philostorgius; and in a Council of nine Bishops which they held at Antioch, they took off the sentence of deposition which they had pro-

α Soz. p. 586. a. β Socr. l. 2. c. 45. p. 159. a. | l. 4. c. 4. p. 213. c. | l. 5. c. 8. p. 264. d. γ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 8. p. 670. a. δ Bas. ep. 403. p. 420. b, c. ε ep. 135. p. 121. ζ Thdrt. p. 669. η Lauf. c. 118. p. 1033. b. θ Aug. in Pet. l. 4. c. 3. p. 142. 2. b. ι Phisg. l. 7. c. 5, 6. p. 91, 92.

nounc'd

nounc'd upon him against their wills in that of Constantinople. This did not hinder Aëtius from getting himself ordain'd Bishop by those of his own faction, and so forming a new party, which separated more and more from that of the Arians, taking the name of Anomœans or Eunomians. [We shall say no more of them in the sequel, because we have given the history of them above. A.D. 362.

We meet with nothing else relating to Arianism during Julian's reign.] κ And indeed, these questions and divisions among the Christians seem'd as it were stifled, whilst this apostate by persecuting them all in general, oblig'd them to unite in some sort against their common enemy; thus it commonly happens among men, foreign wars make domestick ones to cease.

SECTION CV.

Jovian declares for the faith, and rejects the petition of the Macedonians: The different inclinations of Valentinian and Valens concerning religion.

[JUlian being gone into Persia to carry on the war, was kill'd there, as may be seen [1] in another place;] λ he died the night before the 27th of June. [Jovian who was elected that very day, apply'd himself to the restoration of the Catholick faith of Nice which he profess'd. He recall'd S. Athanasius whom Julian had banish'd again, and even [2] order'd him to come to him at Antioch, where he receiv'd him very favourably, and despis'd the petitions which the Arians presented to him against the Saint.] μ It is even pretended, that he made a law to restore all the Churches to the Catholicks; ν and it is certain that he caus'd one to be given them which was built a little before at Antioch. A. D. 363.

[1] See Julian, §. 26.

[2] See S. Athanasius, §. 103, 104.

[But [3] as he chose rather to gain people by mildness and good-nature than awe them by authority, which made him

[3] See Jovian, §. 5, 6.

κ Soz. l. 6. c. 4. p. 640. d.
λ Amm. l. 25. p. 295.
μ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 2. p. 661, b, c.
ν c. 21. p. 696. b.

leave

A.D. 363. leave every body very much to their liberty in the affair of religion,] ξ all the heads of the several sects imagin'd they could each of them bring him over to their own party, and hasted to be before-hand with each other in their applications to him. ο The Macedonians were the first who addres's'd him, π not in person, but by a petition which was presented to him ρ in the name of Basil of Ancyra, of Silvanus of Tarsus, Sophronius of Pompeiopolis, σ Pacinicus of Zena [or Zenopolis in Lycia,] of Leontius of Comana, Callicrates of Claudiopolis [in Bithynia or that Pontus which was call'd Honorias or Pontus Honorii,] and Theophilus of Castabala [in Cilicia, and without doubt of others of the same party, who had deputed] these seven Bishops to go and present it from them.

τ In this petition, after having thank'd God for setting Jovian over the Empire, they desir'd his Majesty to confirm
† Note 79. what had been done † at Seleucia, to annull what the power of some others had caus'd to be done to the contrary, υ and to turn out the Anomœans,(they meant the pure Arians by this odious name without doubt) to turn them out, I say, of the Churches which they possess'd, and put them in their hands. φ That if it was not thought proper * to reunite the Churches this way, they propos'd a General Council, where all the Bishops should be present, but by themselves,[without any Commissioner from the Emperor,] and that all that some people should do by themselves [contrary to the common opinion,] as had happen'd in Constantius's reign [in the Council of Seleucia,] that all this should be void and of no effect. They added, that they were not [all] come to present their petition themselves, for fear of being troublesome; but that if his Majesty would give them leave, they should be very glad to wait upon him, and take the journey at their own expence.

χ All that Jovian answer'd to this petition, was that he hated disputes, that he lov'd on the contrary and bestow'd honours upon those who were for unity and concord. ψ This

ξ Socr. l. 3. c. 24, 25. p. 202. c. | 203. a, b. ο c. 25. p. 203. b. π Soz. l. 6. c 4. p. 641. a, b. ρ a. Socr. l. 3. c. 25. p. 203. b. σ Socr. p. 203. b. τ Soz. l. 4. c. 6. p. 641. a. υ Socr. p. 203. φ Soz. p. 641. b. | n. p. 138. 1. b, c. χ Socr. l. 3. c. 25. p. 203. c. ψ c. | c. 24. p. 202. c. | Soz. l. 6. c. 4. p. 640. d.

* This is the sense which appear'd to us to be the best among many others which this passage is capable of.

answer

anſwer which was ſoon made publick, cool'd the heat of thoſe who thought of nothing but renewing the diſputes which the perſecution under Julian had ſtifled. A.D. 363.

[The Arians on their ſide were no leſs afflicted to ſee themſelves abandon'd by Acacius of Cæſarea, who had appear'd the ſoul and head of their party during the laſt years of Conſtantius's reign.] ω But it is ſaid, that he had no other party but his intereſt, no other faith but the opinion of thoſe who had the moſt power. When therefore he ſaw, that Jovian [declar'd for the Nicene faith, and] expreſs'd a great deal of regard for S. Meletius, [5] he join'd that Saint, was preſent at the Council which met at Antioch, and there ſign'd the Nicene creed. Many others who had been of his party, did the ſame thing, [but ſome with more ſincerity, as S. Pelagius of Laodicea and Athanaſius of Ancyra, [6] who had been rais'd to the epiſcopate by Acacius.

[5] See S. Meletius, §. 8.

[6] See §. 94.

We ſay nothing of what S. Hilary, S. Euſebius of Vercellæ, and even Pope Liberius did in Italy and Illyricum towards the re-ſettling of the Church there, and getting the Council of Ariminum univerſally condemn'd, becauſe we have given an account of it under the title [7] of S. Hilary.

[7] See S. Hilary, §. 14.

Jovian died, to the great ſorrow of the Catholicks, upon the 16th or 17th of February in the year 364. Valentinian who ſucceeded him upon the 26th of the ſame month, made his brother his aſſociate in the empire [8] upon the 28th of March, and reſign'd the government of the Eaſt to him. He profeſs'd the Catholick faith, and perſever'd in it to the end; but he did not defend it with the zeal that might have been expected from a Confeſſor; for that was the title Valentinian had acquir'd in Julian's reign. Nay, at firſt ſetting out he gave the Church a deep wound. For being come to Milan about the end of this year, and finding there Auxentius, one of the moſt wicked among the Arians, in poſſeſſion of the churches, [9] he made no difficulty to join with him upon his making an equivocal profeſſion of his faith. And when S. Hilary would lay open the poiſon of this profeſſion, he receiv'd orders to retire from the city. A. D. 364.

[8] See their titles.

[9] See S. Hilary, §. 16, 17.

Notwithſtanding this, the Catholick faith remain'd perfectly victorious in the Weſt, and Arianiſm was baniſh'd entirely from that part of the world, except at Milan in Italy, Singidunum, Murſa, Sirmium, and a few other ci-

ω Socr. p. 203. c, d. | Bar. 363. §. 139.

ties

A.D. 364. ties in Illyricum, where the famous Urſacius, Valens, Germinius, and their diſciples maintain'd it as long as they liv'd; I ſay, excepting theſe places, the Weſt was entirely free from it, till God permitted it to be re-eſtabliſh'd there by the Goths in the following century. But we ſhall not treat of that here; and we ſhall even reſerve for the title of Pope Damaſus and S. Ambroſe, the little there is to ſay upon the Arians of the Weſt during this age, excepting what was done there in the year 366. So that we ſhall have little to ſay now but of what paſs'd in the Eaſt.

We ſhall find there in Valens a prince quite different from his brother in the affair of religion, who was deſtin'd by the ſacred order of God's providence to exerciſe the faith and patience of his ſervants for many years.] α Socrates ſays, that he had already been baptiz'd by Eudoxius, and that he profeſs'd Arianiſm before he was rais'd to be Emperor. β Theodorit on the contrary ſays, that he was not then fallen into Arianiſm, γ that he even follow'd the apoſtolick doctrine, and that he was baptiz'd by Eudoxius ſome years after, [that is in 367;] δ and S. Jerom's confirmation of this laſt point is too ſtrong to let us depend upon Socrates, ε tho' he ſeems to have been follow'd by Sozomen.

[But I do not know whether we can agree with Theodorit in what he adds, or at leaſt inſinuates,] ζ that Valens follow'd the true faith till the time of his baptiſm. [For before that we ſhall find him favouring the Arians, and even perſecuting the Catholicks, either out of his own private inclination, or elſe to follow the inſtigations of his wife Albia Dominica,] who having been ſeduc'd firſt by the Arians, was the Eve that made this Adam fall, and engag'd him at laſt by her unhappy influence to expoſe himſelf for a prey to the devils by becoming a ſlave to the Arians. [And certainly he would not have been brought all at once to receive baptiſm from the Chief of the Arians, if he had not before made ſome alliance and engagement with them.]

η Valentinian was already ſet out from Conſtantinople [in May] to come into the Weſt; but he had not yet paſs'd through Thrace, when ſeveral of the Macedonian Biſhops, eſpecially thoſe of the provinces of Helleſpont and Bithy-

α Socr. l. 4. c. 1. p. 210. d. β Thdrt. l. 4. c. 5. p. 665. c.
γ c. 11. p. 672. b. δ Hier. chr. ε Soz. l. 6. c. 6. p. 645. d.
ζ Thdrt. p. 672. b, c. η Soz. l. 6. c. 7. p. 646. a.

nia,

nia, having desir'd Hypatian Bishop of Heraclea to be their spokes-man, came to him to make a representation of the disputes among the Bishops concerning the faith, [and to obtain an order from him that should favour their party. They addres's'd themselves to him, because Valens thought of nothing at that time but being subject to him, for as yet the Empire was not divided betwixt them.] Hypatian laid before him what the rest had commission'd him to say; and Valentinian made him this answer, [which is since become very famous,] That as to himself who was only a layman, he was not allow'd [10] to trouble himself in matters of this nature; but that the Bishops to whom the care of these things was committed, had nothing to do but to meet together where-ever they pleas'd. A.D. 364.

[10] πολυπραγμονεῖν.

[The Macedonians might perhaps upon this hold some assembly,] [θ] which they came to give an account of to Valens, when he was [at the end of the year] at Heraclea [in Thrace,] in his return from Pannonia, whither he had been to conduct his brother. [But this is not the Council of Lampsacus, which we are going to speak of, [11] for that was held the following year.]

[11] Note 80.

SECTION CVI.

The Macedonians hold a great Council at Lampsacus: Eudoxius gains Valens, and sets him against them.

[[1] VAlens who was at Constantinople at the beginning of the new year, left that place in the spring in order to go into Syria. But having stay'd at Cæsarea in Cappadocia till the month of September, the revolt of Procopius which we mention'd [2] in another place, hinder'd him from going any farther.] A.D. 365.

[1] See Valens, §. 1, 2.

[2] See §. 98.

[1] Whilst he was yet at Constantinople, several of the Macedonian Bishops came to wait upon him, desiring leave

[θ] p. 647. a, b. [1] Socr. l. 4. c. 2. p. 211. d.

A.D. 365. to hold a new Council, in which to settle what related to the faith. κ He consented to it, hoping, says Socrates, that they would all agree with Eudoxius and Acacius of Cæsarea in Palestine. [It is possible, as we said before, that Valens might already, by reason of his wife, be somewhat favourably inclin'd towards Eudoxius. As for Acacius, who had sign'd the Consubstantiality in the Council of Antioch in 363 in Jovian's reign, it is astonishing to see him here joining with Eudoxius; and indeed it is not easy to judge whether this proceeded from his usual inconstancy, or whether it is a mistake in Socrates.]

[3] See Note 80.

λ The Council was held [3] this year, seven years after that of Seleucia, in the city of Lampsacus, which lies upon the streights of the Hellespont. μ Eustathius of Sebastia came thither with a great many Bishops, and being at Eusinoe, [which is some place upon the road,] he desir'd S. Basil [who was then a Priest of Cæsarea in Cappadocia,] to come to this town [of Eusinoe.] They conferr'd together upon the faith, and S. Basil dictated to Eustathius's secretaries some discourses against the hereticks.

ν The Council sat debating for two months; and at last it annull'd and repeal'd all that had been done at Constantinople by the authority of Eudoxius and Acacius. ξ It anathematiz'd the confession of Ariminum, ο which they had made the Prelates sign, by promising them to condemn the doctrine of those who maintain'd that the Son was unlike in substance, which yet they had not perform'd. It declar'd, that the Son was like in substance, the word *like* being necessary, said these Bishops, to mark the distinction of Persons. π It resolv'd, that the confession of faith compos'd at Antioch and sign'd at Seleucia, should be receiv'd in all the Churches. [It seems however as if they made some addition to it,] ρ since among the several confessions which S. Basil reproaches Eustathius with having sign'd, he mentions that of Lampsacus; [unless we should say, that S. Basil accuses him chiefly for his inconstancy in the faith, which appear'd no less in signing two confessions one after another, than in always signing different ones. For I do not see

κ p. 212. a. λ p. 212. a, c. μ Bas. ep. 79. p. 143. d.
ν Soz. l. 6. c. 7. p. 646. b, c. ξ Socr. l. 4. c. 4 p. 213. b.
ο Soz. p. 646. b, c. π d. | Socr. p. 213. b. ρ Bas. ep. 72. p. 118. c. | ep. 82. p. 155. a.

where

where the difference lies between] σ the confession of Constantinople and that of Nicæ in Thrace, with the signing of which he likewise reproaches him. A. D. 365.

τ The Macedonians having settled what related to the faith after their manner, order'd in their own behalf, that those who had been depos'd by the Anomœans, (by which they meant the Arians,) should be restor'd to their sees, as having been unjustly dispossess'd: [for they were very glad to get those things ratified by a more celebrated assembly, which they had already order'd in others, as well for their restoration, as for the abolition of the confession of Arimi-num. But that this re-establishment might look the better, as many of them were accus'd of personal crimes,] υ they added that if there were any who had a mind to prosecute them, they might do it in the common forms, which inflict the same punishment upon the plaintiff when he does not prove what he advances, as he would make the defendant suffer; and that the affair should be judg'd by the orthodox Bishops of that province and the neighbouring ones, who should meet in the Church where the life and conversation of the persons accus'd were best known.

φ After these decrees, they cited Eudoxius and those of his party, and gave them a certain time in which to come and ask pardon for their misbehaviour; and as they did not come, χ they declar'd that Eudoxius, Acacius, and their accomplices had been lawfully depos'd, [as well by themselves, as by the Council of Seleucia;] ψ and gave notice to all the Churches of what they had order'd. ω So that Eleusius and his party were the strongest at that time; and this Council which, says Socrates, confirm'd the doctrine of the Macedonians more than ever, was the cause of this sect's being dispers'd chiefly in Hellespont, where this assembly had been held.

α Eudoxius could not at first oppose the decrees of the Council of Lampsacus, because of the civil war [with Procopius,] which broke out at that time. β It began upon the 28th of September, and was finish'd in May the following year.

σ ep. 82. p. 155. a. τ Soz. p. 646. d. υ p. 646. d. φ p. 647. a. χ Socr. p. 213. b. ψ Soz. p. 647. a. ω Socr. p. 213. b, c. α b. β Idat.

A.D. 365. γ Socrates and Sozomen say, that before the revolt of Procopius, Valens came to Antioch, banish'd S. Meletius the Bishop of that place, and rais'd δ a great persecution upon the Church. [The account of the journey is certainly false; what they say of the persecution with regard to the rest, may possibly belong to another time; but it is not entirely improbable, ε that S. Meletius was banish'd at this time, and recall'd some time after upon the account of the war with Procopius.

δ &c.

ε See S. Meletius, §. 9-11.

If it is true that Valens declar'd himself so soon as now in favour of the Arians, we must no longer wonder if the Council of Lampsacus represents Acacius as newly engag'd with these hereticks, whom he seem'd to have quitted two years before. I believe this is the last time that history mentions him as living: This is perhaps the reason that makes] ζ Baronius place his death in the year 366. [And indeed, what we shall say η in another place of his successors, may make us think that he died whilst the Arians and Catholicks had as yet pretty near the same power, that is in the first year of Valens's reign. We have θ spoken of his writings and his genius, when we gave an account of his entry upon the episcopate in the year 338.] ι It is not improper to observe with Baronius, that we must not confound him with Acacius the sophist, κ who was of Cæsarea in Palestine, and flourish'd about the same time with Libanius, tho' with greater reputation; but he died young.

η See S. Cyril of Jerusalem, §. 3.

θ See §. 28.

A.D. 366. [Valens, who found himself in danger of losing both the Empire and his life by the revolt of Procopius, was deliver'd from all his fears upon the 27th of May 366, by the defeat of this rebel, who was brought to him the next day. But the peace of the State was not that of the Church; and tho' Valens had not as yet rais'd an open persecution against her, yet he gave strong proofs of his inclination for Arianism. The Macedonians were not orthodox, but they were less impious than the Arians; and they were perhaps more hated by them than the Orthodox, because they had left them but a little while ago.] λ They were even, according to Sozomen, much more powerful in Asia and Thrace than the Catholicks, who were extremely oppress'd

γ Socr. l. 4. c. 2. p. 212. b. | Soz. p. 647. c. δ Bar. 366. §. 32. ε §. 32. ζ Eun. c. 15. p. 135, 136. η Soz. l. 6. c. 10. p. 650. a, b.

there,

there, and the former resisted the progress of Arianism in A.D. 366.
that part of the world with much more vigour than the latter. [So that they were the first who felt the effect of the interest that Eudoxius had with Valens, according to the accounts of the historians.

They had held, as we said, their Council at Lampsacus the year before; and the disturbances in the Empire had given them the advantage for some time. But seeing that they were over,] [d] and fearing lest Eudoxius and his party should gain the ascendant over the Emperor, they resolv'd to acquaint him with the result of their assembly, and for that end went to wait upon him at Heraclea in Thrace, if Sozomen does not confound this assembly with some other. But Eudoxius had been before-hand with them; so that when these deputies of the Council of Lampsacus went to make their application to Valens, he advis'd them to agree with Eudoxius. They refus'd, and represented to him the tricks and artifices which this Bishop had made use of [in 359] at Constantinople, and how he had destroy'd all that had been defin'd in the Council of Seleucia: These remonstrances made him angry with them. He commanded them to be carried into banishment, and order'd that all the Churches should be given to those of Eudoxius's communion. [History does not tell us what happen'd to the other Prelates: but we are going to give an account of what we can learn of Eleusius.]

SECTION CVII.

Eleusius submits to the Arian Council of Nicomedia: Sabinus Bishop of the Macedonians at Heraclea writes the history of them: Valens persecutes them together with the Novatians and Catholicks.

VALens wish'd to see all his subjects Arians; and he was particularly exasperated against the Bishops of the Council of Lampsacus, because that assembly had con-

[d] c. 7. p. 647. a, b. [e] Socr. l. 4 c. 6. p. 214, b, c.

A.D. 366. demn'd the Arian Bishops, and more because it had anathematiz'd the confession of Ariminum. When therefore he was come to Nicomedia, and had caus'd an assembly of Arian Bishops to be held there, he had Eleusius of Cyzicus one of the heads of the Macedonians brought thither, and commanded him to embrace the Arian faith. Eleusius refus'd at first, but [as all his seeming piety was not founded upon Jesus Christ and the true faith,] the fear of banishment and confiscation with which he was threatned, got the better of his resolution.

κ He had no sooner committed this fault, but he repented of it. He return'd to Cyzicus; and there in the midst of the congregation of his people, he complain'd with tears of the violence he had suffer'd, protested that the consent he had given to heresy, was the effect of the force which had been us'd towards him, and not of his will: but that since he had renounc'd his own faith, the Church must choose another Bishop for its guide. The people of Cyzicus, who lov'd him mightily, would not hear of this, and always continued attach'd to his government and his tenets. λ Philostorgius gives an account likewise of this same regard which the people of Cyzicus had for Eleusius's faith.

[This detail which we have of the history of the Macedonians, comes without doubt from] μ Sabinus Bishop of their sect at Heraclea in Thrace, whom Socrates often quotes. For he had made a collection of the pieces or acts of several Councils, [which he inserted without doubt into an history which he wrote,] ν for Socrates complains that he does not mention Macedonius his Patriarch's being made a Bishop. ξ It appears that he began his history from the time of the Council of Nice, [and the first rise of Arianism.] ο He gave a very long account of the Council of Seleucia. π He mention'd likewise those synods which the Macedonians held in Julian's reign, ρ and it is from him that Socrates takes the synodical epistle of that of Antioch in 363. σ He own'd likewise, that the deputies of the Macedonians sign'd the Nicene creed [in the year 366,] and join'd Pope Liberius's communion.

κ c. λ Phisg. l. 9. c. 13. p. 128. μ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 22. a. ν l. 2. c. 15. p. 92. c. ξ l. 1. c. 8. p. 22. b. ο l. 2. c. 39. p. 146, c, d. π l. 3. c. 10. p. 182. d. ρ c. 25. p. 204. d. σ l. 4. c. 12. p. 224. d.

[We

[We must not be surpriz'd,] τ that a Macedonian should A. D. 366
speak honourably of Eusebius of Cæsarea [and the other authors of Arianism,] nor that he should endeavour on the contrary to lessen the character of the Fathers of the Council of Nice, υ and decry S. Athanasius. φ But Socrates accuses him not only of this, but of not being so faithful in his work as an historian ought to be: for he voluntarily omitted several things, confounded [the order of] others, and turn'd every thing to the advantage of his sect, instead of searching after nothing but the truth. χ He inserted the epistle of the Council of Antioch to Julius, but not this Pope's answer to it; and generally speaking, he omitted all the pieces that establish'd the Consubstantiality, whereas he took a great deal of care to insert in his collection all those that favour'd the abolition of it, or that did not make for it. ψ It seems as if he entirely omitted not only the ordination, but the whole history of Macedonius, that he might not be oblig'd to give an account of so many cruelties as had made him odious. ω He omitted likewise all the cruelties that were committed at Alexandria [in 373,] after the death of S. Athanasius, because, says Socrates, as he was half an Arian, he conceal'd the shameful and unjust oppressions which his friends had been guilty of: α and he never spoke against them.

[But as the Macedonians, tho' Half-Arians, were yet since the year 360 very opposite to those who were wholly so, I do not know whether this moderation of Sabinus towards them will not shew that he wrote in Valens's reign, during the time that the pure Arians were all-powerful. So that he might perhaps succeed Hypatian, who was alive in 364.] β Vossius places him a little later without any particular reason for it.

γ Socrates and Sozomen say, that Eudoxius being inform'd that Eleusius had retracted what he had done at Nicomedia, [1] sent Eunomius to Cyzicus to turn him out from thence by the Emperor's authority, and to take his place. [But we have observ'd [2] in another place, that Eunomius

[1] &c.

[2] See § 97.

τ l. 1. c. 8, 9. p. 22. b. | 31. d. υ l. 2. c. 15. p. 92. b. φ l. 1. c. 8. p. 22. b. χ l. 2, c. 17. p. 95. b. ψ c. 15. p. 92. b, c. ω l. 4. c. 22. p. 231. a, b. α l. 2. c. 15. p. 92. c. β Voss. h. g. l. 2. c. 20. p. 262. | l. 4. c. 20. p. 497. γ Socr. l. 4. c. 7. p. 215. a, b. | Soz. l. 6. c. 8. p. 648. c, d.

A.D. 366 had already form'd a contrary party to that of Eudoxius as early as in Jovian's reign at the lateſt. This very much confirms the account of Philoſtorgius his diſciple and Theodorit, who place his ſubſtitution in the room of Eleuſius, and his depoſition by Eudoxius himſelf, in Conſtantius's reign, about the year 360 and 361. And as on the one hand no body teſtifies, that he was made Biſhop of Cyzicus twice, and on the other Philoſtorgius who gives an account of the courſe of his whole life, mentions ſeveral particulars directly contrary to what Socrates and Sozomen ſay in this place, it is difficult to think that theſe two authors were not miſtaken, at leaſt with regard to the order of time.

It ſeems that Eleuſius was not the only Semiarian that felt the violence of Valens: and I do not ſee any time better than this, in which to relate what S. Baſil ſays,] ϑ that after the Council of Lampſacus Euſtathius ſign'd the confeſſion of Nicæ in Thrace. [It is pretty difficult to judge what confeſſion this was, unleſs we ſuppoſe it to be that of Ariminum, which was firſt ſign'd at Nicæ in Thrace about the tenth of October 359, and that Valens compell'd Euſtathius to ſign it over again, as he had oblig'd Eleuſius to do.

The Catholicks of Conſtantinople fell under the laſh of his fury as well as the Macedonians;] ε and he turn'd them out of the city, or at leaſt he order'd them to depart: [but this did not hinder them from ſtaying there, or from returning ſoon after.]

ζ The Novatians who follow'd the Nicene faith, were likewiſe turn'd out of the town together with Agelius their Biſhop, of whom Socrates and Sozomen ſay wonderful things; and their churches were ſhut up: but they were ſoon open'd again, and Agelius recall'd by the intereſt of a Prieſt of their ſect call'd Marcian, whom Valens had ſet over his daughters Anaſtaſia and Caroſa to teach them grammar and polite learning. [It ſignify'd little to Valens and the devil that Marcian was an heretick, provided he was not a Catholick: and what S. Cyprian obſerv'd of theſe ſame Novatians, was to be ſeen at this time, That the devil does not uſe to perſecute thoſe who are his ſervants already.

ϑ Baſ. ep. 82. p. 155. a. ε Socr. l. 4. c. 9. p. 217. d. ζ p. 218. a. | Soz. l. 6. c. 9. p. 649. a, b.

As

As the Catholicks were his real enemies, he treated them by the permission of God, in a very different manner. For to make use of S. Gregory Nazianzen's allegorical terms:] *n* There appear'd at that time all on a sudden a cloud charg'd with hail, its frightful cracks carried horrid death with them on all sides, and it demolish'd all the Churches over which it burst, that is all those where Valens set his foot. This Prince was no less an enemy to Jesus Christ, than a lover of money; and he was no less disorder'd with the disease of heresy, than with that of avarice. θ His eyes were not capable of raising themselves to the knowledge of the august Trinity; and as they were continually poring upon the earth by the influence of those who had the ascendant over him, he endeavour'd to bring down the Divinity thither likewise, and to place in the rank of creatures the divine and uncreated nature of his Saviour. A.D. 366.

ι It was by the impulses of this impiety, that he had declar'd against the Catholicks a more cruel war than all those of the Barbarians; for it did not destroy houses, towns, and other things of that nature, but robb'd them of their very souls. He was accompany'd with an army worthy of himself, that is these wretched Prelates, these cruel [3] tyrants over the people, who had already subdued part of the Churches, who attack'd others, and hoped to reduce the rest by the assistance and power of the Emperor, who us'd some violence already, and threatned more and greater for the future.

[3] Tetrarchs.

[However we know nothing particular of this persecution, but that] κ Valens being come, whilst he was [4] in this fury, to Cæsarea in Cappadocia, where he pretended to put the churches into the hands of the Arians, Eusebius who was then Bishop of the place, being fortify'd by the courage and eloquence [5] of S. Basil, [did not surrender cowardly like Dianius his predecessor,] but defended the truth with so much resolution, that Valens and all his Arian Bishops were oblig'd to depart without doing what they intended.

[4] Note 81.

[5] See S. Basil, §. 41.

n Naz. or. 20. p. 337. d. θ p. 338. b. ι b, c. κ d. Soz. l. 6. c. 15. p. 656, 657.

SECT-

A. D. 366.

SECTION CVIII.

The Macedonians resolve to unite both in faith and communion with the Western Church against the Arians; they send a deputation to Pope Liberius: Their deputies sign the Nicene creed.

[AT this time was to be seen something pretty extraordinary, hereticks persecuting hereticks as much or more than they did the Catholicks. This war of Satan against himself gave ground to hope, that the end of his reign was approaching; and the event verify'd the saying of Jesus Christ. It shew'd, that God had permitted the persecution of the Semiarians, not only to begin in this world to inflict condign punishment upon those who were to continue in their infidelity, of which number we may reckon Eustathius of Sebastia and Eleusius of Cyzicus; but likewise by an unhappy violence to drive into the haven of the Catholick Church those who were predestinated to eternal salvation, among whom we may hope was Silvanus of Tarsus, considering the manner of S. Basil's speaking of him,] λ who calls him Blessed after his death.

[It is probable, as we said before, that many among them held no other faith but that of the Church: But their refusal of the word Consubstantial might give ground to suspect them still; and tho' it appears, that they were in the communion of some Catholick Churches of Asia Minor, since S. Basil was particularly intimate with Eustathius, yet it is certain from the Council of Tyanæ, that they were separated from those of the West, and even from part of the East.]

μ When therefore they saw themselves persecuted with the utmost rigor by the Arians, they sent several messages to one another to consult about what they had to do; [and not having the liberty of meeting all together in the same place,] ν they held several synods at Smyrna, in Pisidia,

λ Bas. ep. 79. p. 143. d. | ep. 82. p. 151. b. c. 12. p. 219. d. μ Socr. l. 4. ν p. 220. b.

Isauria,

Isauria, Pamphlia, and Lycia; ξ and at length they resolv'd, A.D. 366.
that it was better to have recourse to the Emperor Valentinian, Pope Liberius, ο and all the other Bishops of Italy and the West, π and embrace their faith, than communicate with Eudoxius and his party.

ρ To this end they sent Eustathius of Sebastia, Silvanus of Tarsus, and Theophilus of Castabala in Cilicia to Valentinian, σ to whom they gave commission not to dispute with Liberius concerning the faith, but to communicate with the Roman Church, and to confirm [by their subscriptions] the Consubstantial faith. τ They likewise gave them several letters from the Councils which had deputed them, υ address'd to Liberius and the Bishops of the West, as those who had always preserv'd from the times of the Apostles the purity of the true faith, and were more oblig'd than others to maintain religion. They desir'd them therefore to assist the Prelates whom they had deputed with all their power, to consult with them upon what was to be done, and to find out a proper method to settle the affairs of the Church. φ In these letters they confirm'd the Nicene faith.

χ If we must place the Council of Paris at this time, as Blondel does, the epistle from which synod we have in S. Hilary, ↓ we must say that the Eastern Bishops wrote a letter to S. Hilary, ω in which they approv'd of the word Substance, α and requir'd that they should look upon Auxentius, Ursacius, Valens, Caius, Megasus, and Justin as excommunicates; that they should likewise reject all the apostate Bishops who were put in the places of those who were turn'd out; and that they should condemn some propositions which they had tack'd to their letter. [But we are of opinion, that [t] all this belongs to the year 360.]

[t] See S. Hilary, §. 12-14.

β The letter which Liberius sent in answer to the Macedonians, is directed to fifty nine Bishops by name, and to the rest in general; from whence we learn who they were that wrote to him. [The fifty nine Bishops which are nam'd, are most of them unknown to us.] γ The first is call'd [Hythius in some editions of Socrates,] Evethus in

ξ p. 219. b. ο p. 220. d. π p. 219. d. ρ d. | Soz. l. 6. c. 10. p. 650. c. σ Socr. l. 4. c. 12. p. 220. a. τ a, b. υ Soz. p. 650. c. φ c. 11. p. 651. c. χ Blond. prim. p. 127. ↓ Hil. fr. 2. p. 1. ω p. 2. α p. 3. β Bar. 365. §. 11. γ Socr. l. 4. c. 12. p. 222. a.

the

A. D. 366. the last, δ and Hypatius in Baronius. [It is probable enough he might be Hypatian of Heraclea,] ε Others choose rather to believe it was one Hypsius, who appears to have been Bishop of Parnassus in Cappadocia, as we shall [2] See §. 130. give an account [2] in the sequel. [I do not know whether Cyril who is the second, was not him of Jerusalem: At least he had always been reputed one of the Semiarian party.] ζ There was however about this time another Cyril in the lesser Armenia. η Elpidius [might be] him of Satala, [unless this Church had been a long time without any Bishop, when S. Basil gave them one in 371. Eortasius was Bishop of Sardis, and Neo of Seleucia. Eleusius's name was not among these fifty nine Bishops: which is strange, since according to the historians he liv'd a long time after.]

θ Eustathius, Silvanus, and Theophilus, the delegates from all the rest, being come to Rome, and not finding [3] See his title, §. 13. Valentinian there, [3] who was in Gaul busy in making war with the [German] barbarians, ι durst not, says Sozomen, pretend to go to him, because the war made the journey impossible: [Which is not very probable, since the scene of the war lay all along the Rhine,] κ and during that time Valentinian generally resided at Paris. [They thought perhaps, that it would be an advantage to them before all things to join the Pope's communion: And thus whatever reason they had for it,] λ they presented their letters to him.

μ Liberius absolutely refus'd at first to hear them, because being Arians, and having abolish'd the Nicene faith, they could not be receiv'd by the Church. ν They answer'd, says Socrates, that they had repented of their error, and were at last come to the knowledge of the truth. ξ They declar'd their sorrow publickly, [either now or the following year in the Council of Tyanæ,] for the surprize through which they had been engag'd to sign the faith of Eudoxius's party, (that is that of Ariminum.) They said, that in order to recover themselves from that crime, they knew of no better way than to come to Rome to learn there the faith of the Fathers, that by approving of this holy doctrine they might make amends for the damage they had done to the Churches by consenting to heresy; ο and that

δ Bar. 365. §. 11. ε Blond. prim. p. 140. ζ Bas. ep. 187. p. 202. d. η ep. 183. p. 197. b. θ Socr. p. 220. a. ι Soz. l. 6. c. 10. p. 650. d. κ Amm. l. 27. p. 334, 335. λ Socr. p. 220. a. μ a. ν a, b. ξ Bas. ep. 82. p. 152. c. ο Socr. p. 220. b.

be-

besides they had already renounc'd the belief of the Anomœans, and own'd that the Son was like the Father in all things, which was acknowledging him to be consubstantial. A. D. 366.

π Liberius would have a written declaration of their principles; upon which they presented him with an act written with their own hand in the form of a letter, which is given us by Socrates. ρ They there take the title of deputies from the Councils of Lampsacus, Smyrna, and others, to Liberius and all the Bishops of the West; [whether the Council of Lampsacus had given them some commission like that which they had receiv'd from the others, which yet is not easy to believe; or whether it was because the Bishops who had deputed them, were the same with those who compos'd the Council of Lampsacus:] σ And indeed they look'd upon all these Councils as making together only one.

τ They approv'd therefore by this act, as well in the name of their brethren as their own, of the decisions of the Council of Nice, and particularly the Consubstantiality. υ They condemn'd Arius with his doctrine and his disciples, and all other heresies, among which they mention that of the Marcellians; but particularly they condemn'd what had been done at Ariminum against the Council of Nice, and the confession drawn up at Nicæ, which they had been made to sign at Constantinople by tricks and perjuries. φ Afterwards they insert the Nicene creed entire with the anathema's of that Council; this they profess to be their true faith, χ which themselves and they in whose name they speak, had held formerly, hold now, and will always hold for the future. ψ At last, after having sign'd this letter with their own hand and of their own accord, as they say, ω they add this promise, That if at any time hereafter themselves, or those for whom they speak, shall be accus'd of any thing, they will submit to the judgment of whatever Bishop the Pope pleases, and will go to wait upon him with letters from his Holiness. [Blondel does not explain this protestation, which had been objected to him, tho' he oblig'd himself to do it. It is somewhat like] α that which Ursacius and Valens made to Julius upon such another occasion in the year 349.

π b. | 221. d. ρ p. 220. c, d. | 221. d. σ c. τ d. υ p. 221. a, b. φ b, c, d. χ a. | 220. d. ψ p. 221. d. ω d. | 222. a. | n. p. 51. 2 d. α Hil. fr. 1. p. 25.

SECT.

A. D. 366.

SECTION CIX.

The Macedonians are receiv'd by Liberius: The death of this Pope.

β AFter the deputies from the Macedonians had made so expreſs and authentick a declaration, γ the original of which was kept at Rome, δ Liberius admitted them to communion, and gave them letters to the fifty nine Macedonian Biſhops whom he names, ε and in general to all the orthodox Biſhops of the Eaſt, as he on his part writes in the name of all the Biſhops of Italy and the Weſt. ζ In the beginning he aſſures thoſe to whom he writes, of the joy which he receiv'd as well from their letters as from the act by which their deputies had ſign'd the Nicene faith, and ſo were united in belief both with him and the Biſhops of Italy and the Weſt. He gives them an account, that almoſt all who had aſſiſted at the Council of Ariminum, had retracted their ſubſcriptions, and were only the more incens'd againſt the Arians becauſe of the violence that had been us'd towards them. [This letter is written in Liberius's uſual ſtyle, who it is certain had not the gift of eloquence.]

η S. Baſil ſays, that the letter which Euſtathius carried to Rome, reſtor'd him to his biſhoprick. [There is no likelihood that he means any other but this, or at leaſt we can find nothing of it, but that the Pope own'd him for a Biſhop of the Catholick Church, which was a precedent for the reſt to acknowledge him as ſuch. And certainly this is what S. Baſil meant.] θ Liberius tack'd to his letter the Act which the deputies had given him; ι which makes S. Baſil ſay, that Euſtathius carried the confeſſion from Rome which he had made of the Conſubſtantiality, κ and that he preſented the Act itſelf to the Council of Tyanæ with his own hand.

λ Baronius does not doubt but Liberius aſſembled a Council at Rome upon ſuch an important occaſion. [But

β Socr. l. 4. c. 12. p. 222. a. γ Baſ. ep. 82. p. 152. d. δ Socr. p. 222. a. ε c. 11. p. 52. 1. a. ζ l. 4. c. 12. p. 222-224. η Baſ. ep. 74. p. 125. c. θ Socr. p. 222. d. ι Baſ. ep. 82. p. 153. e. κ p. 152. c. λ Bar. 365. §. 16.

there

there is some reason to be surpriz'd at Eustathius and the others not being oblig'd to renounce their errors against the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. And therefore we must be forc'd to say, that they did not as yet explain themselves so publickly upon this error, and that they did not then know in the West that this was one of the chief points of their doctrine. A. D. 366.

This action was in all probability the last of Liberius's pontificate,] μ for he died upon the [23d or] 24th of September this [1] year 366, as we learn from Marcellinus the Priest, whose authority is preferable to any other. ν So that as he began his Popedom upon the 22d of May 352, [he govern'd fourteen years, four months, and a day or two.] ξ It is written, that he was buried upon the Salt-way in the church-yard of Priscilla. [1] Note 82.

ο Soon after his death we meet with a church that bore his name, without doubt because he had built it. π It is held for certain, that it is that [2] which is call'd at present Santa Maria Maggiore; and other names have been given to it. ρ It was Pope Sixtus III, who dedicated it under the name of the Blessed Virgin after the Council of Ephesus. [It is pretended that there was another Church of Liberius's near the Vatican, where his image is to be seen to this day. [2] Note 83.

The crime of Liberius, any more than that of some others, did not hinder the Church from having a veneration for his memory;] σ and his name is to be met with in most of the Latin martyrologies, which bear S. Jerom's name, in Rabanus, Vandelbert, in the old editions of Bede and several others. Most of them place him upon the 23d of September, and some upon the 24th: τ The Greeks have set him down in their office upon the 27th of August as a Saint and glorious Confessor. υ Some ancient martyrologies place at Rome upon the 17th of May S. Liberius a Bishop. But it is not known whether this is not some other Saint. φ Two manuscripts fix his festival to the 24th of April with Pope Bennet II, probably because of the translation of their bodies by Sergius II about the year 700.

μ Mar. & F. p. 4, 5. ν Buch. p. 273. | Boll. pont. p. 51. c. ξ Boll. apr. t. 1. p. 31. 2. ο Mar. & F. p. 6, 7. π Bar. 367. §. 6. | Florent. p. 726, 727. ρ Florent. p. 729. σ p. 854. 2. | Boll. pont. p. 51. f. τ Menæa, p. 293. υ Florent. p. 535, 536. φ Boll. pont. p. 51. f. | 52. a.

It

A. D. 366. It is obſerv'd, that the Cophtites likewiſe honour him upon the ſixth of October.

[The veneration of his memory is authoriz'd by the moſt illuſtrious of the Fathers.] χ For S. Epiphanius calls him *bleſſed*, ↓ and S. Baſil *very happy*. ω Siricius depends upon the decrees of Liberius his predeceſſor of venerable memory. α S. Ambroſe calls him Liberius of happy β and holy memory, γ and reports a diſcourſe that he made publickly to Marcellina his ſiſter, δ when ſhe took upon her the veil of virginity on Chriſtmas day in S. Peter's Church. He us'd often to entertain himſelf with his ſiſter about this diſcourſe, and, ſays he, ſo much the more holy as the man was who pronounc'd it, ſo much the more agreeable was it to me. [But it is plain that S. Ambroſe has dreſs'd it in his own ſtyle, very different from the Pope's, whoſe [3] language was not very polite, as may be judg'd from ſome of his letters which are ſtill remaining in S. Hilary and ſome other places.] ε That to S. Athanaſius which we have in Greek, and which is as it were a confeſſion of faith, [4] [is at leaſt very much to be ſuſpected.] ζ For as to the epiſtle to the ſame Saint which is only in Latin, and that which is addreſs'd to all the Biſhops, both of them dated under Conſuls who never were, it is agreed that they are manifeſtly ſpurious. [I do not think that we are very certain of the genuineneſs] η of the three Decretals which are aſcrib'd to him. θ Siricius cites his defence of rebaptizing the Arians.

[3] See S. Athanaſius, Note 68.

[4] See S. Athanaſius, §. 111. Note 68.

[5] See S. Damaſus, §. 1 -- 3.

[5] Damaſus was elected in the room of Liberius; and every body knows the troubles that follow'd upon this election; but this is not the place to relate them.]

χ Epi. 75. c. 2. p. 906. b. ↓ Baſ. ep. 74. p. 125. c. ω Conc. t. 2. p. 1018. a. α Amb. virg. l. 3. p. 473. c. β p. 475. m. γ p. 473 -- 475. δ p. 473. c. ε Conc. t. 2. p. 756. ζ p. 760. c. | 765. b. η p. 768. c. θ p. 1018. a.

SEC-

SECTION CX. A.D.366.

The Macedonians are receiv'd in several parts of the West: The Arians in Illyricum fall out among themselves.

ι TO go on with the history of Eustathius and the other deputies from the Easterns: After they had receiv'd Liberius's letters, they went to Sicily, where they got the Council of the province to meet. There likewise they confess'd the Consubstantiality and the Nicene faith, and receiv'd letters from the synod of the same tenor with the Pope's.

κ Socrates and Sozomen say, that they return'd from thence into the East. [' But it seems necessary to say, that they went first to other provinces, either all together, or which is more probable, one to one place, another to another, to save time.] λ For it is certain, according to Sozomen, that they brought letters to the Council of Tyanæ not only from Liberius and the Bishops of Sicily, but likewise from those of Italy, Africa, and Gaul, who all agreed in the same sentiments, and who were much more in number than those who were present at the Council of Ariminum, [tho' there were there no less than fourscore.

1 Note 84.

If they were likewise in Illyricum, as it is easy to presume, they may possibly have been the cause of the change of Germinius Bishop of Sirmium the chief city of Illyricum, who leaving the grossest blasphemies of the Arians, came over about the end of this year to the Semiarian party, and seem'd even almost Catholick.] μ We have a profession of faith of this Bishop's, in which he declares that he believes the Son to be a true Son, perfect, and entirely like the Father in Divinity, majesty, [2] and many other things. ν The title of this profession imports, that he made it against the Arians who had sign'd at Ariminum against their conscience, [which I do not well understand. It seems that he did not draw it up till after 364,] ξ in

2 &c.

ι Socr. l. 4. c. 12. p. 224. b, c. κ c. | Soz. l. 6. c. 12. p. 652. b. λ Soz. p. 652. b, c. μ Hil. fr. 2. p. 6. ν p. 5. ξ in Aux. p. 121. a. d.

A. D. 366. which year S. Hilary joins him with Ursacius, Valens, and Auxentius, as an accomplice in all their blasphemies.

[Whether therefore it was because of this profession of Germinius's, or whether it was upon any other account,] o the report being spread among the Arians, that he had left their principles, Valens [of Mursa] and Paul who was likewise an Arian, wrote to him about it, as may be gather'd from a letter where this passage is corrupted, and charg'd him at the same time to punish some of his Clergy, who were accus'd of abusing the Bishops Palladius and Caius. Germinius wrote back to them by Jovian a Deacon and Martyrius a Subdeacon, and declar'd that he was very ready to preserve peace and charity with them; but he does not satisfy them upon the point of his faith: But on the contrary Jovian and Martyrius declar'd, that he maintain'd that the Son was like the Father in all things. He gave them no more satisfaction in the affair of his Ecclesiasticks who were accus'd.

π Upon this Valens and Paul being met together at Singidunum with Ursacius and Caius, they wrote all four to Germinius to press him to declare plainly, that he held the confession of Ariminum which he had promis'd not to abandon, and which said only that the Son was like the Father, but not that he was so in substance, nor in all things. They would likewise oblige him to protest that he had not said, that he did not now say, and that he would never say that the Son is like the Father in all things, excepting that the Father was not begot. They promis'd him, that provided he would give satisfaction in these points, they would leave the punishments of his Ecclesiasticks who were accus'd to his own discretion. We have this letter still remaining, dated the 18th of December 366. They who wrote it, kept a copy of it.

[We do not see what happen'd afterwards.] ρ But we have a letter of Germinius's to eight Bishops, none of them the same with any of the four mention'd above, in which he tells them he had learnt from an officer of the Prefect's, that these eight Bishops desir'd to know of him what the other four had to object against his faith; σ upon which he declares to them, that he held that the Son was like the Father in all things, except his being begotten, that he is

o fr. 1. p. 40, 41. π ibid. ρ p. 41. σ p. 42.

God

God of God: [3] That he owns no difference between the Divinity of the Father and that of the Son: τ That the Divinity of the Father is no less truly in the Son according to the form of God, than our flesh is truly in him according to the form of a Servant: That he is no more a creature than a sheep, a door, &c: υ And that all these words did not denote his Divine generation, according to which he did not spring out of nothing, but was begotten of God his Father. However he agrees to the confession of Sirmium, sign'd in the presence of Constantius of happy memory [upon the 22d of May 359.] φ He had this letter sign'd by three Priests, because he had a distemper in his hands; χ and sent it by a lay-officer, because he was the first he could find after a Deacon whom he had sent to these same Bishops. He desires them to publish his principles to all the world, ↓ and to give him their opinion upon them. [We know nothing more of this affair. A. D. 366. [3] &c.

In the sequel we shall see Ursacius, Valens, and Caius excommunicated by the whole Church. We have [4] already said,] ω that when Eunomius was banish'd about 369, and carried through Mursa, Valens receiv'd him there, and us'd him very kindly; and having waited upon the Emperor with Domninus of Marcianople, they prevail'd upon his Majesty to recall this infamous Arch-heretick and pardon him. [It seems pretty probable [5] that he follow'd the Emperor Valens to Cæsarea in the year 371.] [4] See §. 99. [5] See S. Basil, §. 40-42.

SECTION CXI.

The Macedonians are receiv'd by the Council of Tyanæ: Several of them reject the union: Valens turns out the Catholick Bishops who were recall'd by Julian; is baptiz'd by Eudoxius.

[EUstathius, Silvanus, and Theophilus being return'd into the East, which we believe could not be before the year 367,] α it happen'd at the same time that a Council was held at Tyanæ in Cappadocia, where were present A. D. 367.

τ p. 43. υ p. 44. φ p. 45. χ p. 44. ↓ p. 45. ω Phisg. l. 9. c. 3. p. 119. α Soz. l. 6. c. 12. p. 652. b.

A.D. 367. Eusebius of Cæsarea, Athanasius of Ancyra, S. Pelagius of Laodicea, Zeno of Tyre, Paul of Emisa, Otreus of Melitene, S. Gregory Nazianzen the father, and several others who had profess'd the Consubstantiality in the Council of Antioch [at the end of 363,] β which must be understood only of part of them; for Otreus was not a Bishop till after that Council had been held, γ for Uranius of Melitene assisted at it.

[As Eustathius and the rest thought of nothing at that time but strengthening themselves by the union with the Catholicks,] δ they apply'd themselves to the Council of Tyanæ, presented to them the letters which they brought from several provinces of the West, ε and Eustathius communicated to them the Act which he had brought from Rome, ζ in which was his subscription to the Consubstantiality, [that is the Pope's letter, with the Act of the deputies that was tack'd to it.]

η All these papers were read with a great deal of joy. θ Eustathius was restor'd to his dignity, [that is, he was acknowledg'd and receiv'd for a lawful Bishop of the Catholick Church:] ι And the Council wrote to all the Bishops of the East, to desire them to read the decrees of the
* Note 85. Bishops of Asia, [that is of the Council of Smyrna and the others who had deputed Eustathius, Silvanus, and Theophilus;] to read likewise the letters from Liberius and the Prelates of Italy, Africa, Gaul, and Sicily; to consider their great number; to signify by their letters that they were of the opinion of these Prelates, [who all embrac'd the Council of Nice and rejected that of Ariminum;] and to meet at Tarsus upon a day they mention'd, whilst the spring would allow it. [It seems therefore that the Council of Tyanæ was held in the beginning of the spring in the year 367, and that of Tarsus order'd to be open'd a month or two after, before the extreme heats of Cilicia could hinder the Bishops from meeting there.]

κ The Macedonians, says Socrates, took several journeys to the Catholick Bishops, to desire them to come to Tarsus, that they might there confirm the Nicene faith, and put an

β Blond. prim. p. 143. γ Socr. l. 3. c. 25. p. 204. c. δ Soz. p. 652. b, c. ε Bas. ep. 82. p. 152. d. ζ p. 153. c. η Soz. p. 652. c. θ Bas. ep. 74. p. 125. c. ι Soz. p. 652. c. κ Socr. l. 4. c. 12. p. 234. c.

end

end to all factions, enmities, and disputes. The thing might very likely have succeeded in this manner; [and it would have been joyful news to the Church: but God would not grant it yet. The Macedonians themselves oppos'd it;] λ and when the Council of Tarsus was ready to be held, about thirty four Bishops of Asia met at Antioch in Caria, and declar'd that they were exceedingly rejoic'd at the care which was taken to restore peace and union to the Churches, but at the same time they rejected the word Consubstantial, and pretended that they must keep to the confession of Antioch which was confirm'd at Seleucia, because it came from the holy martyr Lucian, and their fathers had been at so much pains and trouble to get it establish'd. A.D. 367.

[It cannot be doubted but the Arians oppos'd the sitting of the Council of Tarsus with much greater vigour than the Macedonians of Asia.] μ The news of its being appointed to meet inflam'd Eudoxius with anger; and as he had the entire ascendant over the Emperor, he us'd those who endeavour'd to get this Council held in such a manner, that he prevented it from meeting. ν He even got his Majesty to write upon this occasion with great threatnings. Sozomen adds as a consequence of the evil counsels of Eudoxius, and of the opposition of Valens to the Council of Tarsus, that this Prince commanded the Governors of the provinces to turn those Bishops out of their Churches, who had been banish'd in Constantius's reign, and restor'd in Julian's. ξ This edict laid great fines upon all the Governors, their officers, and the magistrates of the towns, if they neglected to put it in execution, and even threatned them with corporal punishment.

ο Sozomen however does not take notice of any other effect of this important edict, but the persecution of S. Athanasius, [2] in which he gain'd the victory: [and we shall see that S. Meletius who was comprehended in this declaration more than S. Athanasius, was not banish'd till some years after. I know not whether we must say, that Sozomen is mistaken in joining this with the Council of Tarsus; or whether the war with the Goths which broke out this year, hindred the effect of it, and slacken'd the persecution a little for the three following years, during which

[2] See S. Athanasius, §. 109.

λ Soz. l. 6. c. 12. p. 652. d. \| n. p. 140. l. 2. μ Socr. p. 224. d. ν Soz. p. 653. a. ξ b. ο a, b.

A.D. 367. we do not find by the historians that it was very violent; or whether S. Meletius was exempted from it for some time by the particular protection of God, as S. Athanasius was.] π Valentinian's letter to the Churches of Asia shews the persecution had already been sharp in that province, and that there had been several Bishops turn'd out [as early as the year 368, if it was written that year, as some learned persons have thought. But this is not certain,
[3] Note 86. and [3] there is even some reason to believe, that it was written several years after.

This however does not hinder but we may believe there was some new persecution of the Catholicks this year.] ρ For Socrates speaking of a prodigious shower of hail
[4] See S. Basil, §. 41. [4] that fell upon the 2d [or 4th] of July, says that many people thought it was a judgment from God, because of the great number of Ecclesiasticks whom Valens had banish'd, for refusing to communicate with Eudoxius.

[5] See S. Athanasius, §. 110. σ We have in S. Athanasius [5] a letter which he wrote about this time to all the Bishops of Egypt, Syria, Phœnicia, and Arabia, exhorting them to continue firm and unshaken during the persecution which was then rais'd against the Church. τ He assures them that most of the Bishops and people preserv'd the faith pure; tho' several of the Bishops conceal'd their principles, some out of ambition to be rais'd to higher preferments, others out of fear of the [Arians] who had the command of the largest towns. υ He recommends very particularly the doctrine of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, [because of the Macedonians.

What we have hitherto said since the year 365, sufficiently shews that Valens had already taken the Arians openly into his protection. Philostorgius will have it,] that Eudoxius who carry'd him over to his party by his artifices, and prepossess'd him against the Catholicks, χ had gain'd the ascendant over him ever since the winter that he pass'd at Constantinople the first year of his reign in 364 and 365. ↓ But his wife Dominica, ω who had deluded him by her persuasions, dragg'd him at last to the bottom of the precipice which she had fallen into herself before him, by persuading him to be baptiz'd by the Arians: Which was

π Thdrt. l. 4. c. 7. p. 668. Ath. cath. t. 1. p. 570. d.
ρ Socr. l. 4. c. 11. p. 218, 219.
σ Nyss. in Eun. l. 1. p. 311. b.
τ p. 571. a, b.
υ c, d. 570. c.
↓ Socr. l. 5. c. 1. p. 260. a.
χ Philg. l. 9. c. 3. p. 119.
ω Thdrt. l. 4. c. 11. p. 674. b, c.

accord-

accordingly perform'd this year according to S. Jerom's chronicle, [which in this agrees exactly with history.] α For Theodorit tells us, that it was when he was making preparations for the war with the Goths; [6 and this war broke out this year in the spring, and lasted till the end of the year 369.] A.D. 367.

6 See Valens, §. 6.

β It was therefore before he engag'd in this war, that he would receive baptism. γ But his complaisance towards his wife made him receive it from Eudoxius, δ who at the same time that he gave him this sacrament, made him promise upon oath that he would always continue firm to his impious doctrine, and banish out of his empire all who oppos'd it. S. Jerom seems to hint at this oath, when he joins the persecution of the Church to the baptism of Valens by Eudoxius. Valens perform'd this promise too faithfully some time after, [when he was disengag'd from the war with the Goths. But we may refer to that time what was already done this year both against the Catholicks, and to prevent the Council of Tarsus from meeting.]

SECTION CXII.

The history of S. Bretanio: Nice is destroy'd: Pope Damasus and S. Athanasius act against the Arians.

ε VALens stay'd all the summer this year near the Danube, which being swell'd too high, he could not get into the country of the Goths. [1 It was very likely at this time that that happen'd which Sozomen relates,] ζ when after having said that some Churches had been preserv'd in the Catholick faith by the courage of their Bishops, he mentions that of Scythia for an example. η This was one of the provinces of Thrace [at the mouth of the Danube,] θ where there were several castles, boroughs, and towns, A.D. 368.

1 Note 87.

α b. β b γ c. δ c. 12. p. 674. d. ε Amm. l. 27. p. 341. ζ Soz. l. 6. c. 21. p. 664. c. η Amm. p. 340. θ Soz. p. 664. d.

A.D. 368. ι the most noted of which were Dionysiopolis, Tomi, and Calata: κ but Tomi, which was a large and rich city upon the Euxine sea, was the metropolis. λ Here it was that the Bishop resided, who by vertue of an ancient custom govern'd the whole province himself.

μ Bretanio who was Bishop at that time, ν was an excellent man in many respects; but above all illustrious for the holiness of his life, ξ and an eminent example of all kind of vertues. [What we are going to relate, is an evident proof of his real worth and goodness.]

ο When Valens was come to Tomi, he went into the Church, and as he us'd to do, would fain have persuaded Bretanio to communicate with the Arians. The Bishop answer'd him with all the freedom and courage of a great man in vindication of the Nicene faith. π He was fill'd with godly zeal. He charg'd this Prince with corrupting the doctrine of the Church, and with injustice in persecuting the Saints: so that he could say with David; "I spoke "of thy testimonies before Kings, and was not asham'd." ρ Then he left him, and went to another Church. All his people who were come together as well to see the Emperor, as because they imagin'd some thing extraordinary would happen, follow'd their Bishop and went with him: so that Valens was left alone with his usual retinue.

σ His Majesty was provok'd at this; and having caus'd Bretanio to be taken up, he order'd him to be banish'd; but he recall'd him quickly after, for fear, as is thought, that the Scythians, exasperated at the banishment of their pastor, should make an insurrecton, which upon the account of their courage as well as the situation of their country might be of dangerous consequence. Thus Bretanio triumph'd over the Imperial power, τ and deserv'd the title of Saint with which the Roman martyrology honours him upon the 25th of January. It is thought, that he was succeeded by Gerontius, who assisted at the Council of Constantinople in the year 381.

υ Valens, after having pass'd the summer in the countries near the Danube, went into winter-quarters at Mar-

ι Amm. p. 340. κ Soz. p. 664. d. λ d. | Thdrt. l. 4. c. 31. p. 703. d. μ ibid. ν Soz. p. 665. b. ξ Thdrt. p. 703. d. ο Soz. p. 664. d. π Thdrt. p. 703, 704. ρ Soz. p. 665. a. σ a. τ Bar. 371. §. 126. | Boll. 95. jan. p. 621. b. υ Amm. p. 341.

cianople

cianople φ in Mæsia near the lesser Scythia, χ taking his Eudoxius along with him, [who as impious as he was, seems yet to have been less so than] ↓ Domninus, who was then Bishop of Marcianople. For Domninus with Valens of Mursa got Eunomius recall'd, whom Auxonius had banish'd into Mauritania, and Valens afterwards having a mind to see Eunomius, Eudoxius prevented it. A. D. 368.

ω There happen'd [2] this year several violent earthquakes, which destroy'd Nice upon the 11th of October, and shortly after the town of Germa in Hellespont. α And yet so many fatal accidents as happen'd in this and the foregoing years, were not sufficient to stop Valens and Eudoxius from persecuting their adversaries with the same fury as before. So that these earthquakes instead of putting an end to the troubles of the Church, were rather presages of their continuance and increase. [2] See Valens, §. 7.

[It is thought that this is the time to place the meeting of] β a Council of Rome, [3] in which Pope Damasus excommunicated Ursacius, Valens, and those who follow'd their principles. S. Athanasius and all the Council of Egypt thank'd him for it, declaring at the same time they were sorry that Auxentius of Milan was not treated in the same manner. γ But we learn from an epistle of ninety Bishops of Italy and Gaul assembled at Rome, that he was at length condemn'd δ before the year 373. The Bishops of Spain, as well as the Councils of Rome and Gaul, condemn'd him unanimously, together with Ursacius, Valens, and Caius of Pannonia. ε Notwithstanding all this, Auxentius continued in possession of the Church of Milan, till God took him out of this life in the year 374. A. D. 369. [3] See S. Athanasius, §. 111.

ζ The epistle [4] which S. Athanasius and the Council of Egypt wrote about this time to the Bishops of Africa, gives ground to believe that there were likewise some persons in that province, who follow'd the errors of the Council of Ariminum, and rejected the term Consubstantial. But we do not find that this made any noise, or was attended with any consequence, either among the Catholicks, or even [4] ibid.

φ p. 340. χ Philg. l. 9. c. 7. p. 124, 125. ↓ c. 8. p. 125, 126. ω Socr. l. 4. c. 11. p. 219. a, c. | Hier. chr. | Idat. | Chr. Alex. α Socr. p. 219. b. β Ath. ad Afr. p. 941, a, b. γ Thdrt. l. 2. c. 17, p. 617. d. δ Ath. ad Epict. p. 582. a. ‡ Bar. 369. §. 37. ζ Ath. ad. Afr. p. 931.

5 among

A.D. 369. [s among the Donatists, tho' Donatus their great master, or
[s] See §. 39. rather their god, had fallen into Arius's errors.]
[|] The Donatists, §. 44.

SECTION CXIII.

Eudoxius dies: S. Evagrius is ordain'd by the Catholicks, and banish'd: Eighty Ecclesiasticks of Constantinople are burnt upon the sea.

A.D. 370. [η] AFTER the peace was concluded, which Valens made with the Goths at the end of 369, his Majesty return'd to Constantinople, [where he spent the rest of the winter and the beginning of the year 370. But whilst he was preparing to make the persecution hotter against the Catholick Church, God rais'd up the great S. Basil to oppose him, by promoting him to the dignity of Archbishop of Cæsarea, that the eminence of his see might put him into a condition of defending with the greater weight and authority the faith, peace, and unity of the Church.]

[θ] At the same time he took Eudoxius out of this world, [the head of the Arian party, and oblig'd him to come and give an account of the injuries he had done his spouse and his faithful servants for so many years, whilst he abus'd his spiritual power, and spoke like the dragon when he had the horns of the lamb.] [ι] For it was eleven years, [that is the eleventh year was begun,] since he govern'd [and tyranniz'd over] the Church of Constantinople under the name of Bishop, [from the 27th of January 360. We have seen how before that he had usurp'd the see of Antioch for two years, and had held that of Germanicia in Syria for eighteen years at least, during which time he had always signaliz'd himself in the defence of Arianism.] [κ] However God permitted his body to be buried in the Church
[1] See Valens, §. 9. of the Apostles, [1] which he had newly consecrated upon the 9th of April this same year,] and to be plac'd under the altar itself, where were deposited the sacred relicks of the

[η] Amm. l. 27. p. 342. [θ] Socr. l. 4. c. 14. p. 225, 226. [ι] p. 226. a. [|] Soz. l. 6. c. 13. p. 655. a. [|] n. p. 52. 2. d. [κ] Cyr. Al. op. 56. p. 203. d.

Apostles

Apoſtles [S. Andrew, S. Luke, and S. Timothy. S. Gregory and the other Catholick Biſhops who came after him, did not think themſelves oblig'd to be at the trouble of removing him,] and there he was fifty years after. A.D. 370.

λ He was come to Nice to place a ſucceſſor there in the room of Eugenius, who died a little while before; but he died himſelf before he had finiſh'd this affair, [and conſecrated] μ Hypatius, the perſon whom at that time the Arians made Biſhop of Nice. This Hypatius was of Cyrus, ν and in all likelihood the man whom S. Epiphanius reckons among Aëtius's diſciples, and who he ſays had been preferr'd by Eudoxius after he had been baniſh'd with his maſter.

ξ Eudoxius died as ſoon as Valens had left Conſtantinople to go to Antioch: but this news ſtopt him at Nicomedia. ο It ſeems he was at Cyzicus the tenth of June; [and therefore we muſt place Eudoxius's death about the month of May.] π He had no ſucceſſor however till after the ordination of S. Baſil, [that is, not till the latter end of the year.]

ρ The Orthodox of Conſtantinople ſeeing Eudoxius dead, [and his ſee vacant,] thought they ought not to loſe ſo favourable an opportunity [of having a Catholick Biſhop,] and they [2] got one ordain'd whoſe name was Evagrius. He was ordain'd [or inſtall'd] by one Euſtathius, σ who cannot be pretended to be [3] him of Antioch, whatever Socrates and Sozomen may ſay. τ It is not impoſſible but he might be one Euſtathius a Prieſt of Conſtantinople, who according to S. Jerom's chronicle ſupervis'd the building of the church of the holy Sepulchre at Jeruſalem in Conſtantine's reign, [if we will have it that he liv'd till this time: And he might have been ordain'd Biſhop. But the beſt way is to believe, that he was ſome neighbouring Biſhop, whom God has made known and ſanctified by this ſingle action, which he rewarded, as he generally does the great works of his grace.]

[2] πεῤῥάλλον]ο.

[3] See S. Euſtathius.

υ For the ordination of Evagrius brought a new perſecution upon the Church from the Arians: and Valens who

λ Phiſg. l. 9. c. 8. p. 126. μ c. 19. p. 133. | n. p. 396. ν n. p. 396. | Epi. 73. c. 38. p. 886. b. ξ Socr. p. 225, 226. ο Cod. Th. chr. p. 87. π Baſ. ep. 254. p. 253. a. ρ Socr. p. 226. a. | Soz. p. 655. b. | Thphn. p. 49. c. σ Socr. n. p. 53. 1. b. | Bar. 370. §. 30. τ Blond. prim. p. 1196. | Hier. an. 337. υ Socr. l. 4. c. 15. p. 226. b, c. | Soz. l. 6. c. 13. p. 655. c.

was

A. D. 370. was at Nicomedia, having soon learnt what pass'd, was afraid lest some dangerous sedition should be rais'd in the city. For which reason he dispatch'd some troops thither, with an order to send Evagrius one way and Eustathius another. It is not known where Evagrius was carried: Eustathius was banish'd to Bizya in Thrace. φ And as the festival of S. Eustathius of Antioch is celebrated upon different days, by the Latins upon the 16th of July, by the Greeks upon the 21st of February, and the fifth of June, it is thought that one of these days belongs to the other Eustathius, of whom we find nothing else said.

[Nicephorus in his chronicle places Evagrius among the Archbishops of Constantinople.] χ The Roman martyrology honours him upon the sixth of March in the number of the holy Confessors. The same thing is said of the Greek Church, but no proof of it is to be met with. [He must die during the persecution under Valens, for if he had surviv'd that, they could not have plac'd any Bishop at Constantinople to his prejudice, nor would there have been any occasion to have sent S. Gregory Nazianzen thither.]

ψ The Arians not being contented with having banish'd Evagrius and Eustathius, exercis'd their power with a great deal of insolence. They tormented, they beat, they revil'd and abus'd the Catholicks; they imprison'd them, they ruin'd them by fines, which they often laid upon them; in short they gave them all the bad usage they could think of. ω Baronius in his martyrology has plac'd upon the 3d of July S. Eulogius and several other martyrs of Constantinople, who he says suffer'd under Valens through the cruelty of the Arians. He cites it from the menologium of the Greeks, [that is, from that of Canisius; yet I can find nothing of it there, any more than in the Menæa.]

α In short, the Catholicks resolv'd to have recourse to the Emperor himself, to give some check at least to the violence of their enemies. β For this purpose they chose eighty Ecclesiasticks, men of piety, the principal of whom were Urbanus, Theodorus, and Menedemus; and these deputies being come to Nicomedia, they presented a

φ Blond. prim. p. 1196. χ Boll. 6. mars, p. 427. ψ Soc. p. 226. c, d. | Soz. l. 6. c. 14. p. 655. d. ω Bar. 3. jul. b. α Socr. p. 226. d | Soz. p. 655. d. β Socr. p. 227. a. | Soz. p. 656. a.

petition

petition to Valens, laying before him the injuſtice and oppreſſion that they ſuffer'd. But this prince, inſtead of being touch'd with any compaſſion, was exaſperated againſt them more than ever: However he did not ſhew his reſentment publickly, but privately order'd the *Præfectus Prætorio* to ſecure them and diſpatch them. This Prefect was Modeſtus, of whom we ſhall often have occaſion to ſpeak. γ He had ſucceeded Auxonius [4] the beginning of this very year, and continued in this office [till the end of Valens's reign, having always kept himſelf in favour by his policy in flattering the paſſions of this prince, by encouraging his indolence, and forwarding his cruelty, particularly againſt the Catholicks, to whom he was an enemy, not only as he was Valens's miniſter and flatterer, but likewiſe becauſe he was an Arian himſelf, and was baptiz'd by the Arians.] A.D. 370.

[4] See Valens. §. 10.

δ However he durſt not execute the Emperor's order againſt theſe Eccleſiaſticks in a publick manner, for fear the death of ſo many perſons, whoſe character, piety, and innocence, made them appear venerable in the eyes of all, ſhould raiſe an uproar among the people. He ſpread a report that theſe deputies were to be ſent into baniſhment, at which they expreſs'd a great deal of joy, ε and he had them put on board † a ſhip, to carry them to the appointed place of exile. But he order'd the ſeamen who carry'd them, to ſet fire to the ſhip when they were out at open ſea, [that the death of the Saints might be the more ſecret,] and that they might not ſo much as have the honour of burial. In ſhort, as the veſſel was ſailing in the middle of the gulf of Aſtaca, [upon which Nicomedia is ſituated;] ζ the ſailors ſet fire to it, and ſav'd themſelves in the long boat. But it happen'd, that the wind being extremely high at this time, the ſhip was driven with a great deal of violence, and was not quite burnt with thoſe who were in her, till ſhe arriv'd at a port call'd Dacidiſus upon the coaſt of Bithynia. η Thus theſe bleſſed Prieſts were

γ Phiſg. n. p. 383. δ Socr. p. 227. b. | Soz. p. 656. a.
ε Socr. p. 227. c. | Soz. p. 656. a, b. | Thdrt. l. 4. c. 21. p. 695. d.
ζ Socr. p. 227. c. | Soz. p. 656. c. η Naz. or 20, 25. p. 348. a. | 433. d. | Thdrt. p. 695. d.

† Theodorit obſerves, that this ſhip had no ballaſt in her, ἀνερμάτιστον.

torment-

A. D. 370. tormented with the utmoſt violence of heat in the middle of the ſea, θ and after having fought againſt fire and water, they at laſt ſunk under the waves, and there acquir'd the crown of martyrdom.

ι The Greek and Latin Church celebrate their memory upon the 5th of September, [which might perhaps be the day of their death.] The Menæa ſay, that they were ſome Prieſts and ſome Deacons: κ Theodorit ſeems to make them all Prieſts. λ S. Gregory Nazianzen ſpeaks likewiſe ſeveral times of Prieſts burnt upon the water in Valens's reign. μ In his 23d oration he mentions but one Prieſt burnt upon the ſea, and deſcribes that accident with all the beauty and ornaments his genius and eloquence were capable of: ν Baronius thinks that theſe are two different ſtories, tho' like one another. ξ And yet Elias Cretenſis ſays, that this Prieſt is call'd by ſome Urbaſus and by others Theodulus. [And we find Urbanus and Theodorus among the eighty deputies of Conſtantinople.]

ο The inhumanity with which theſe Eccleſiaſticks were treated, was puniſh'd with a great famine, which ſo waſted Phrygia and the neighbouring parts, that moſt of the inhabitants were oblig'd to leave the country. This is ſet down to this year in the chronicles of S. Jerom and Idatius: [and we ſhall ſee that it continued the following year likewiſe.]

SECTION CXIV.

Demophilus of Berea is made Biſhop of Conſtantinople by the Arians.

π THE Arians therefore being abſolute maſters at Conſtantinople, this Church fell into the hands of De-
ρ Note 88. mophilus, ' who was before Biſhop of Berea in Thrace [ever ſince 347, in which year he came to Sardica with the

θ Thdrt. p. 695. d. ι Menæa, p. 81. κ Thdrt. p. 695. d.
λ Naz. or 20, 25. p. 348. a. | 433. d. μ or. 23. p. 416.
ν Bar. 370. §. 35, 36. ξ Naz. or. 23. n. p. 825. d. ο Socr. l. 4. c. 16. p. 227. d. π Socr. l. 4. c. 14. p. 226. a. | Thdrt. l. 5. c. 39. p. 756. | Phiſg. l. 9. c. 8, 19. p. 126, 133.

other

other Arians: And he signaliz'd himself in their party by contributing to the fall of Pope Liberius, who was banish'd to his city.] ρ He was of Thessalonica, of a pretty good family. σ He fix'd himself in the see of Constantinople by the interest he had with Valens, without having his translation [2] authoriz'd by any legal Council [even of his own sect,] tho' they publish'd it. τ So that instead of the usual acclamation, *He is worthy*, some of the people cried out at his instalment, *He is not worthy*. The chief author of his promotion was [3] Dorotheus of Heraclea, who pretended [as metropolitan of Thrace] to have a better right of doing it than any other person. υ This Dorotheus was [originally] of the same province of Thrace. [We do not find whether he was made Bishop after the death of Hypatian, of whom we meet with no account after the year 363, or whether Hypatian having declar'd for the Semiarians, Dorotheus was put into his place either by the Council of Constantinople in 360 or in Valens's reign.] φ We shall see him brought by the Arians to the see of Antioch after the death of Euzoïus, and afterwards to that of Constantinople in the year 386. χ Philostorgius accuses him of being extremely vain. A. D. 370.

[2] Note 89.

[3] Note 90.

ψ He treats Demophilus no better, but represents him as a man of an impetuous turbulent spirit, who could not help quarrelling and was always confounding every thing, especially what related to the doctrines of religion. For proof of this he brings some passages out of the first sermon they had from him, which was taken in writing at the same time that he preach'd it by those who heard him, and another fact which happen'd at Constantinople.

ω He declar'd openly against the Eunomians, and persecuted them very much. [He seems on the contrary to have been pretty favourable to the Macedonians; and I do not see any other sense can be put upon what S. Basil says of the beginning of his episcopate:] " α All, says he, who come " from Constantinople, unanimously declare, that he has " an outward appearance of piety, [4] and seems in some " measure to follow the true faith, insomuch that he re- " unites the parties which divide the city, and some of his

[4] τὶ πλάσμα ὀρθότητος.

ρ Phisg. l. 9. c. 14. p. 129. σ c. 8. p. 126. | Thdrt. p. 756. τ Phisg. l. 9. c. 10. p. 127. υ c. 19. p. 133. φ c. 14. p. 128, 129. & alii. χ p. 129. ψ ib. | Suid. δ. p. 685. ω Phisg. p. 129. α Bas. ep. 254. p. 255. a, b.

" neigh-

A.D. 370. "neighbouring Biſhops have embrac'd his communion." [There is little reaſon to underſtand this of the Catholicks, conſidering the horrid perſecution which the Arians rais'd againſt them upon his firſt arrival, according to the hiſtorians, as we are going to relate.] β And the Council of Aquilea which calls him the [5] cruel head of perfidiouſneſs, aſcribes particularly to him and Lucius of Alexandria all the barbarities which the Arians had committed upon the Catholicks.

[5] *Dirum perfidiæ caput.*

γ Philoſtorgius relates, that Demophilus being gone to Cyzicus with Dorotheus of Heraclea and ſome others, to ſettle a Biſhop there, becauſe the people being attach'd to Eleuſius's doctrine, would not bear [any other but him] ſince the departure of Eunomius [in 360 or 361,] he could not compaſs his end of making them receive one, till he had publickly both by word of mouth and by writing anathematiz'd Aëtius, Eunomius, and all who follow'd their principles; and that even then he was forc'd to ordain him whom the people had elected, and who declar'd openly for the Conſubſtantiality. [We know not what to ſay of this ſtory. Philoſtorgius uſes to confound the Conſubſtantiality with the Likeneſs of Subſtance. Beſides,] δ Eleuſius was alive, according to Socrates and Sozomen, in 383; [and it is difficult to believe, that the people of Cyzicus who were ſo ſtrongly attach'd to him, would either themſelves elect or ſuffer the election of another Biſhop as long as he liv'd.]

SECTION CXV.

A general deſcription of the perſecution under Valens.

A.D. 371. [S. Meletius [1] Biſhop of Antioch ſeems to have been baniſh'd as early as the beginning of this year; by which we ſee that Valens perſecuted the Catholicks in places at the greateſt diſtance from him, as well as in thoſe

[1] See his title, §. 9.

β Cod. Th. app. p. 73. γ Phiſg. l. 9. c. 13. p. 128. δ Socr. l. 5. c. 10. p. 269. a. | Soz. l. 7. c. 12. p. 719. c.

which

which were near him. We even find by an epistle of S. Basil's written in all likelihood about the middle of this year,] ε that those who defended the faith in every church, had been banish'd; [and we are soon going to see this particularly true of the provinces of Asia minor.] ζ S. Gregory Nazianzen says likewise, that Valens did not come to attack the Church of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, [at the end of this year,] till the other neighbouring cities had been already subdued, and that of Cæsarea alone had escap'd the fury of the Arians. η Theodorit says, that Valens would not fall upon S. Basil the first, for fear the example of his courage should fortify the rest; θ and S. Basil himself says, that the persecution had ravag'd the greatest part of the East, when it began to reach Cappadocia. [We must not therefore stay to begin the account of the persecution under Valens at the time that he came to Antioch in 372, as the Church-historians do, since it was already very violent this year at least. A.D. 371.

Before we give the detail of the misfortunes it occasion'd in this and the following years, we must see S. Gregory Nazianzen's general description of it, speaking in the name of the Church of Constantinople, of which he was Bishop at that time, before the hundred and fifty Fathers of the second General Council.] ι Valens, says he, was a persecutor, who had no more humanity in him than Julian, or rather he outdid him so much the more in cruelty, as he was a false Christ that bore the name of Jesus Christ. He was the shame and infamy of the Christians, who could not obey him without impiety, nor gain any glory by suffering under him. For he did not seem to be guilty of injustice in punishing those who were not obedient to him; and the glorious title of Martyrdom was not given to the torments he made them endure: So that he seem'd to have found out a way of making the world believe they were punish'd as impious wretches, when they suffer'd for being Christians. κ The same Father will not allow people to search for any other cause of these misfortunes than the sins of the Christians, who instead of framing their lives according to the law of God, follow'd their corrupt nature and vain imaginations, and by that had deserv'd to be aban-

ε Bas. ep. 220. p. 233. a. ζ Naz. or. 20. p. 347. a. | 348. b.
η Thdrt. l. 4. c. 16. p. 682. b. θ Bas. ep. 297. p. 288. c, d.
ι Naz. or. 32. p. 512. b, c. κ a.

A. D. 371. don'd to the moſt wicked and moſt profligate of all mankind.

[He enlarges more in another diſcourſe, where reproaching the Arians with their cruelties by way of oppoſition to the behaviour of the Catholicks, he directs his diſcourſe to them in the following words:] " λ Books, ſays he, are full " and all converſation runs upon the effects of your bar- " barity. Poſterity will be acquainted with them, and " will load you, I doubt not, with eternal infamy. What " can be ſaid like this of the Catholicks? What inſolent " people have we ſtirr'd up againſt you? What ſoldiers " have we arm'd to oppoſe you? Have we ſent a General " againſt you more furious and paſſionate than thoſe whoſe " orders he executed; a man who not being a Chriſtian, " thought he paid a religious duty towards the devils in " impiouſly perſecuting the Catholicks? Have we ſur- " rounded with troops perſons whoſe hands were lifted up " to God, and who thought of nothing but offering their " prayers to him? Have we drown'd the muſick of pſal- " mody with the noiſe of trumpets? Have we ever ming- " led the myſtical Blood [of Jeſus Chriſt] with the blood " of murder'd men? Where have we ſtopt ſpiritual ſighs " and groans with doleful and terrible lamentations? " Where have we dried up the tears of contrition and " compunction, to cauſe thoſe of ſorrow and affliction? " Where have we turn'd the houſes of prayer into ſepul- " chres? When did we deliver into criminal hands the " veſſels appointed for the holy Myſteries, which no bo- " dy is allow'd to touch? O amiable altars, as the Scripture " calls you, but which we may now call profan'd altars, " have we ever ſet lewd young people upon you, to defile " you with laſcivious airs, with immodeſt poſtures and ge- " ſtures? Or rather have we ever inſulted the great and " divine Myſtery which is offer'd upon you? Auguſt and " venerable throne, upon which ſo many illuſtrious and " holy Prelates have ſat ſucceſſively to preach the divine " Myſteries, have we plac'd any Pagan upon you, to turn " the Chriſtian truths into ridicule by ſatyrical and impious " diſcourſes? Holy Virgins, the ſeat of purity and modeſty, " who cannot bear the ſight of even the chaſteſt men, I " appeal to you whether ever any of our people have out-

λ Naz. or. 25. p. 432 --- 434.

" rag'd

" rag'd you with abominable glances, and abuſes deſerv- A.D. 371.
" ing the puniſhment of Sodom. What wild beaſts have we
" let looſe to devour the bodies of the Saints, as theſe in-
" human wretches have done to ſome people, who were
" guilty of no other crime but not embracing their impious
" tenets, and not polluting themſelves with their ſacri-
" legious communion, which they fled as the poiſon of a
" ſerpent, that would not kill bodies, but corrupt and de-
" ſtroy ſouls; or elſe were charg'd with burying ſome per-
" ſons, whoſe dead bodies were reſpected by the very fleſh-
" devouring beaſts? This indeed is a crime, which well
" deſerv'd to be puniſh'd in another theatre and by other
" beaſts. Where are the Biſhops, whoſe bodies, already
" worne out with age, we have torne with iron nails in the
" preſence of their diſciples, who could not aſſiſt them
" under their pains but with vain and fruitleſs tears?
" Who, I ſay, are thoſe Prelates, who have been thus hung
" up with Jeſus Chriſt, who have been victorious by their
" conſtancy in the midſt of their torments, who have wa-
" ter'd their people with their precious blood, and who
" at length have been carried to execution to be buried
" and glorified with Jeſus Chriſt, whoſe victory over the
" world ſtill continues by the murder and immolation of
" theſe victims? Who are thoſe Prieſts, whom fire and
" water, two contrary and incompatible elements, ſepa-
" rated from one another, and who were conſum'd with
" their ſhip in the midſt of the flames? And not to enter
" into the detail of all the miſeries we have ſuffer'd; who
" are thoſe whom the Prefects themſelves have accus'd of
" cruelty, tho' they were the inſtruments of it? For tho'
" they were the executioners of the paſſions of their So-
" vereigns, yet they could not but deteſt ſuch ſtrange bar-
" barity; and they did not throw away their reaſon en-
" tirely, tho' they comply'd with the times. Their com-
" plaiſance in obeying the cruel intentions of the Empe-
" ror, did not hinder them from being ſo equitable as to
" condemn the injuſtice of what they were oblig'd to be
" the unhappy inſtruments."

μ The Church had not only an Emperor to ſtruggle with at that time, but likewiſe all the magiſtrates and all the miniſters of his Court. Some encourag'd his paſſions, becauſe

μ Nyſſ. in Eun. t. 2. p. 311. b, c.

A.D. 371. they were engag'd in the same erroneous principles. Many others did voluntarily every thing that could be agreeable to him for fear of angering him and incurring his displeasure. Some devoted themselves to him out of opposition to the people who profes's'd the true faith: [And they thought they could not do this at a better time than] when the Emperor punish'd all who would not obey his will, with confiscations, banishments, fines, imprisonment, chains, whippings, and the most cruel torments. For it was more dangerous then for pious persons and Catholicks to be found in the house of God, than to be convicted of the most enormous crimes.

ν There was no place free from the sad effects of so dismal a time: No nation escap'd the ravages and fury of this heresy. All those who made the greatest figure in the Church, saw their designs and labours destroy'd. No people could secure themselves from their insults, neither Syria, nor Mesopotamia, nor Phœnicia, nor Palestine, nor Arabia, nor Egypt, nor Libya, nor Pontus, nor Cilicia, nor Lycia, nor Lydia, nor Pisidia, nor Pamphylia, nor Caria, nor Hellespont, nor the neighbouring isles even to Propontis, nor Thrace, nor all the countries upon the Danube. There was only Cappadocia that was so happy as not to fall under the misfortunes of the times, as the other countries did, because the great S. Basil who was its protector, shelter'd it from all these storms; [yet not without any exception, as will be seen in the sequel.]

ξ The persecution against the Catholicks, [which was already so odious in itself, was more so,] because that at the same time as the most faithful servants of God were treated thus barbarously, on the other hand all the enemies to the Church, Hereticks, Jews, or Pagans, were allow'd free liberty and toleration: [So that it seem'd as if it was not so much in Valens an excessive inclination for the party he had unhappily embrac'd, as an hatred of truth and all who lov'd it, which the devil inspir'd him with.]

ο This persecution was still the more dangerous, because most of the Churches wanted pilots at the helm. For Valens banish'd them all, π to put unhappy pirates in their places, who attempted to lose the vessels, ρ for they usurp'd

ν p. 315. b, c. ξ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 21. p. 696. a, b. | l. 5. c. 20. p. 733. a, b. ο l. 4. c. 16. p. 682. a, b. | v. Pat. c. 8. p. 814. d. π v. Pat. c. 2. p. 780. b. | Nyss. in Eun. t. 2. p. 312. b, c. ρ Nyss. p. 312. b, c.

the

the episcopate only to be a shame and disgrace to it. σ And yet this artifice was of no service through the courage of these holy Prelates, who from the utmost parts of the earth whither they were banish'd, supported the faithful and confuted the hereticks by the letters which they wrote. For he whose providence governs all things, had given pilots to his people at that time whose skill was equal to the violence of the tempest, heads whose courage was answerable to the fury of the enemy, and remedies proportion'd to the dangerousness of the disease. A.D. 371.

SECTION CXVI.

Valens leaves Constantinople to go to Cæsarea: He persecutes every where as he goes along: A short account of what pass'd between S. Basil and him.

[WE must now see the particulars of what we have taken notice of in general, and follow Valens in his journey.] τ For notwithstanding the famine which God sent for a punishment of his crimes, [1] he left Constantinople [about the middle of April at the soonest,] to go to Antioch. υ He was at Ancyra upon the 13th of July. φ He travell'd very slowly, [and did not get through Cappadocia this year. χ As he was still puff'd up with the advantages he had obtain'd over the [Goths in 369,] he would not allow any thing to oppose his will and pleasure, [the chief bent of his mind being to establish Arianism.]

[1] See Valens, § 10.

↓ He order'd [Modestus] the *Præfectus Prætorio* to go before him, who as if it had been one of the essential duties of his office, took a great deal of care not to leave in the cities any [Bishop] that maintain'd the orthodox faith, but banish'd them all, and put others in their places. Be-

σ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 27. p. 701. d. τ Socr. l. 4. c. 16, 17. p. 227, 228. | Nyss. in Eun. p. 321. b. υ Cod. Th. chr. p. 89. φ Zos. l. 4. p. 742. d. χ Nyss. in Eun. p. 312. b. ↓ b, c.

A. D. 371. ing gone from Propontis [and Conſtantinople] with this reſolution, as a cloud which was to deſtroy all the Churches, he laid Bithynia waſte in a moment; made himſelf maſter of all Galatia without any reſiſtance, ω according to the uſual inconſtancy of that nation; and at laſt after all the tragedies acted in theſe provinces, where he did not ſpare for puniſhments, α he fell upon Cappadocia, hoping to conquer that with the ſame eaſe.

[S. Gregory deſcribes the ſame thing in a different manner. For before he relates the ſtruggles between S. Baſil and Valens, he ſpeaks thus of the preceding occurrences:] β Valens, ſays he, began with ſignalizing himſelf by baniſhments, expulſions, confiſcations, by ſnares viſible and conceal'd, by wheedling diſcourſes when the opportunity ſeem'd favourable, and by open violence when ſmooth words would not do. They turn'd out of the Churches thoſe who profeſs'd the Catholick tenets, and put thoſe in poſſeſſion who follow'd the Emperors pernicious and poiſonous doctrine, who requir'd impious ſubſcriptions, and who themſelves ſign'd the greateſt impieties. They gave orders to the impious Generals, not to go to fight with the Perſians, not to go and ſubdue the Scythians, or repel any other barbarous nation, but to make the churches their ſlaughter-houſes, to profane the altars, to defile them with the blood of men and victims, to violate and force the modeſty of virgins.

γ This conflagration at laſt reach'd Cappadocia, which had already perceiv'd the ſmoak of it, according to S. Baſil's expreſſion, by the report of the affliction of the others, which had made it ſhed tears of compaſſion and tenderneſs: [and it had already ſeen ſome ſparks of the flame. For in a letter, which might be writ perphaps about the middle of this year;] δ S. Baſil ſays that the affairs of the Church were as yet uncertain in Cappadocia; that Evippus was come, but had declar'd nothing; that however the enemy threatned to make the people of their party come from a canton of Armenia which he calls Tetrapolis, and from Cilicia. ε This Evippus was an old Biſhop, and a man of eloquence. But he was an Arian; which oblig'd

ω p. 313. a. α a, b. 312. c. β Naz. or 20. p. 347, 348. γ Baſ. ep. 297. p. 288, c, d. δ ep. 57. p. 86, b. ε ep. 265. p. 264. e.

S. Ba-

S. Baſil to ſeparate from him, tho' he had ſome particular reaſons to love him. ζ He had aſſiſted with the other Arians at the Council of Conſtantinople [in 360,] where he had depos'd Euſtathius and the other Semiarians; η and thoſe people had ſaid a great many things againſt their depoſers, and againſt Evippus in particular: θ Biſhop Anyſius, whom S. Baſil calls a poor ſervant, was his diſciple. A. D. 371.

[This incurſion of Evippus was like a skirmiſh before the general battle which look'd as if it would follow Valens's arrival. This prince came to Cæſarea at the end of the year 371, and ſtay'd there in all likelihood till the March after.] A. D. 372.

ι He paſs'd it ſeems through Nazianzum, where Gregory the Biſhop, aſſiſted by the reſolution and eloquence of his ſon [who as yet was only a prieſt,] couragiouſly oppos'd all the attempts of the hereticks. [Hiſtory does not give us an account of the particulars.]

κ There was nothing more remarkable in all the perſecution under Valens, than what happen'd at Cæſarea. [But as we muſt reſerve this for the hiſtory of S. Baſil, we ſhall content ourſelves with ſaying here, that the reſolution of this great Saint was tempted in vain by the threats and promiſes of Modeſtus the Prefect, by the ſolicitations of Mardonius the Lord Chamberlain, and of ſeveral others of the chief officers of ſtate, and by all the luſtre and magnificence of the imperial authority. The invincible courage of this Saint made his greateſt enemies his admirers; and Valens himſelf came to the Church, which S. Baſil allow'd him to do out of condeſcenſion, and receiv'd his offerings.

The Arian faction had however ſo much power as to ſet Valens again againſt him, and it was expected that as ſoon as the night was over, he was to be carried into baniſhment. But that very night, Valentinian Valens's only ſon fell ſick of a malignant fever, which oblig'd the father and mother to have recourſe to S. Baſil, and they had without doubt obtain'd the life of their ſon through his prayers, if they had not had the weakneſs to let him be baptiz'd by the Arians: upon which the child died immediately.

ζ ep. 72. p. 117. d, e. η p. 118. b. | ep. 73. p. 120. e.
θ ep. 10. p. 53. b, c. ι Naz. or. 19. p. 312. b, c. κ or. 20. p. 347. d.

A.D. 372. Valens's ſorrow upon this occaſion ſtopt his deſign of baniſhing S. Baſil for that time. The Arians ſoon made him reſolve upon it again. But when he was going to ſign the order, three pens that he took one after another, broke of themſelves, and his hand trembled: ſo that at laſt yielding to the power of God, he came a ſecond time to the Church, conferr'd with S. Baſil, and entertain'd an extraordinary opinion of him. So he let him govern his church in peace, gave an handſome eſtate for an hoſpital that he built, and even ſupported him with his own authority in placing Biſhops in ſeveral cities of Armenia.] λ God was pleas'd upon ſo remarkable an occaſion to ſhew that he is King of Kings, that he knows how, when he pleaſes, to ſecure his ſervants from all the efforts of their power, and that therefore when they are abandon'd to their cruelty, it is he himſelf who gives them up, not out of weakneſs, but becauſe he has a mind to try the courage of his Saints, and to crown their patience, [or for other reaſons worthy of the wiſdom of a God.]

μ The viſible care which he took to protect S. Baſil, and the eſteem which he had made Valens entertain of him, occaſion'd that not only the Church of Cæſarea, but in general all Cappadocia, and the Catholicks of Pontus enjoy'd a pretty great calm during the reſt of Valens's reign, [yet not without ſome trouble, as will be ſeen in the ſequel.] ν It appears that in 375 the Churches of Zela and Amaſea in Pontus were poſſeſs'd by the Arians: [but this did not hinder the people from continuing Catholick,] and they ſeem to have receiv'd the aſſiſtance of the Church from ſome miniſters of the neighbouring Biſhops. ξ And indeed, Sozomen aſſures us that the Arians having baniſh'd Eulalius Biſhop of Amaſea, to put an heretick in his place, Eulalius found at his return after the perſecution, that there were not fifty perſons who own'd the Arian.

λ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 16. p. 684. b. μ Naz. or 20. p. 351. d. | 357. | Baſ. ep. 77. p. 134. b. ν Baſ. ep. 72, 73. p. 118. b. | 121. a, b. ξ Soz. l. 7. c. 2. p. 706. a.

SECT.

SECTION CXVII.

Flavian, Diodorus, and S. Aphraates maintain the cauſe of the Church againſt Valens; who perſecutes the Orthodox of Antioch.

[WHatever opinion Valens might have of S. Baſil, or how much ſoever he might be afraid of him, yet his heart was not at all chang'd, any more than Saul's, as appears by all the courſe of his life afterwards. He left Cæſarea as ſoon as winter was over.] ο For we have plain proofs, that he was at Seleucia upon the 4th of April, and at Antioch upon the 13th of the ſame month. [It was in this laſt city that he generally reſided all the reſt of his reign, employing himſelf as much in perſecuting the Catholicks as in the affairs of the State.

His firſt efforts would have fallen upon S. Meletius Biſhop of Antioch, if he had not already been baniſh'd into Armenia, either as early as the year 371,] π or at lateſt ever ſince the beginning of 372. [The Church of Antioch being thus depriv'd of the care of its Pilot, ſeem'd to be in evident danger of being ſhipwreck'd.] ρ But Flavian and Diodorus Prieſts of that Church, σ who had ſo glorioufly defended it in Conſtantius's reign when they were only laïcks, τ did the ſame thing now againſt Valens; and, like two rocks, cutting the waves of the perſecution with unſhaken conſtancy and reſolution, they broke the impetuoſity and violence of them: They took the care of governing the flock upon themſelves; and at the ſame time that they oppos'd the wolves with as much wiſdom as courage, they fed the ſheep with the ſpiritual nouriſhment that was neceſſary for them.

υ Flavian was the General in this battle, in which they fought for the faith, and he order'd Diodorus [and the reſt] to the ſtations where they would ſucceed the beſt. For at this time he did not preach in the Church-aſſemblies, but furniſh'd thoſe who did with arguments and paſſages of

ο Cod. Th. chr. p. 90. π Baſ. ep. 273. p. 265. c. ρ Thdrt. v. Pat. c. 2, 8. p. 780. d. 815. d. σ his. l. 2. c. 19. p. 621, 622. τ l. 4. c. 22. p. 696. c. υ p. 697. a, b.

Scrip-

A.D. 372. Scripture: And thus some bent their bows against the blasphemies of Arius; and Flavian drew out of his brain as out of a quiver, and gave them the arrows that pierc'd these hereticks. However he often spoke against them both in private and publick, and with a great deal of ease discover'd the tricks of their reasoning, and shew'd that their objections were only cobwebs.

[God join'd other preachers to Diodorus and Flavian, as is plain from what we just now said.] φ There was particularly S. [r] Aphraates an hermit, of whose vertue we say nothing in this place, [any more than of that of the others of that profession.] χ They were likewise assisted by John and Stephen, whom S. Meletius afterwards made Bishops, the first of Apamea, the other of Germanicia. These were they who [with the others] govern'd the assembly of the Orthodox in the storm. It is observ'd of John in particular, that being illustrious by birth, he made himself more so by his own merits than by those of his ancestors, and that he was equally remarkable for his eloquence and his life. [S. John Chrysostom would without doubt have made himself more famous than all the rest, unless he had consider'd that he was a new convert,] ψ and had been afraid, according to the precept of S. Gregory the Great, that his vertue like a tree newly planted, would wither with the noise of outward actions, and as it were with the touch of the hands of those whom his vertue would make his admirers, [which made him choose rather to keep himself quiet in the shade of solitude, to take stronger root, and let the walls of this tower grow dry, which was damp and new-built, and which by the course of time and the increase of his vertue became perfectly impenetrable by all the devices of the most violent temptations.

The Church of Antioch had occasion without doubt for pilots as skilful as these were of whom we are speaking, to steer it in the tempests which shook it at that time:] ω For Valens who was at peace with all his neighbours, arm'd all his fury against the Catholicks, and every day invented new punishments for them. α He had not so much as the courage to hear without trembling of the ravages which the barbarians sometimes committed in his provinces, and yet

[r] See his title.

φ b, c. χ l. 5. c. 4. p. 708, 709. ψ Greg. in Job. 29. p. 223, 224. ω Socr. l. 4. c. 32. p. 250. b, c. α Thdrt. v. Pat. c. 8. p. 815. a, b.

he

he employ'd all the force of his arms against his fellow-citizens and subjects, because they lov'd and embrac'd piety. β He tormented and executed a great number of them, some one way, others another; but generally speaking he had them drown'd in the river Orontes, γ which runs at the foot of the walls of the city and of the palace of Antioch on the North side. A.D. 372.

δ He turn'd them out of the churches at first, [that is out of the Palæa or Old one which they had always held,] and out of one newly built which Jovian had given them. They met therefore at the foot of the mountain, [near the city,] ε where there were some caverns into which they say the Apostle S. Paul had formerly retir'd and hid himself. ζ There they sung the praises of God, and heard his divine oracles, notwithstanding all the inclemencies of the air to which they were expos'd, in spite of the rain, the snow and frost of winter, and the extreme heat of summer.

η But they were not allow'd even a liberty so free from envy as this was, for soldiers were sent to drive them from this place. θ They left it therefore, and assembled upon the banks of the river under the care of Flavian and Diodorus, who bless'd [2] the Creator and benefactor of mankind in all places, submitting entirely to his will and power. [It was there that] ι Diodorus fed all the town beyond the river, as S. John Baptist had done, with his wholsome doctrine. κ It was there that he put himself at the head of the Faithful, and stood like a tower against all the efforts of the hereticks, and like a rock broke all the waves of the persecution, keeping by his resolution the whole body of the Church in a perfect calm in the midst of the storm. λ It was he who with Flavian and Aphraates taught the people, agreeably to the maxims of David, S. Paul, and Jesus Christ himself, that they must sing the praises of the Lord at all times and in all places, in the fields and upon the mountains, in the city and the suburbs, in private houses and publick places.

[2] &c.

β Socr. l. 4. c. 17. p. 228. a, b. | Soz. l. 6. c. 18. p. 660. b. γ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 23. p. 697. c, d. δ c. 21. p. 696. b. ε v. Pat. c. 2. p. 782. c. ζ his. l. 4. c. 21. p. 696. b. η b. θ c. 22. p. 696. d. | v. Pat. c. 8. p. 815. b, c, d. ι Chry. de Di. p. 234. κ Fac. l. 4. c. 2. p. 157. λ Thdrt. v. Pat. c. 8. p. 815. c, d.

μ The

A.D. 372. μ The hereticks would not suffer the Catholicks to meet near the river any more than at the former place. So Flavian and Diodorus carried them to the artillery-ground, where they nourish'd them with the spiritual herbs of the divine word. ν But they were driven from thence likewise by the violence of the soldiers, ξ and oblig'd to meet in the country, from whence comes the title of Rusticks, which S. Jerom gives those of S. Meletius's communion. ο It appears that this artillery-ground where they met for some time, lay out of the city on the north-side; π and to go to it, they must come in sight of the palace where the Emperor was.

ρ It was upon this occasion that the conference between S. Aphraates and Valens happen'd, which was follow'd [3] by the death of an eunuch who had threatned the Saint; σ which prevented his being sent into banishment: This story is related by Theodorit at large. τ This Saint made the Emperor admire his power at another time, by curing one of his horses at the desire of his groom or querry, who was an honest man, and very firm in the true faith. But tho' these miracles astonish'd the enemies to truth, υ yet they did not set their hearts right, nor hinder Valens from continuing in his fury against the Son of God, till he was punish'd for it by the hand of the Goths. φ He grew somewhat mild, if we may believe Socrates and Sozomen, upon the remonstrances of Themistius, [4] who address'd a discourse to him upon this subject, wherein he represents to him among other things, that the Heathens had above three hundred different opinions of the Deity; but this lenity, [from whatever cause it proceeded,] went no farther than banishing the Ecclesiasticks instead of executing them.

3 &c.

4 See Theodosius I. §. 94.

μ his. l. 4. c. 22. p. 696. ν v. Pat. p. 815. a. ξ Bar. 386. §. 58. | Blond. prim. p. 203, 459. | Hier. ep. 57. p. 131. b. ο Thdrt. v. Pat. c. 2. p. 780. c. π his. l. 4. c. 23. p. 697. c, d. ρ p. 697, 698. | v. Pat. p. 816, 817. σ v. Pat. p. 817. c. τ d. | 818. υ p. 818. c. | his. l. 4. c. 13. p. 698. d. φ Socr. l. 4. c. 32. p. 250. c. | Soz. l. 6. c. 37. p. 696. c.

SEC.

SECTION CXVIII. A.D. 372.

S. Julian comes to support the Catholicks of Antioch: S. Basil writes to them: Diodorus is baniſh'd: Perſecution of the Churches of Syria: Of S. Pelagius Biſhop of Laodicea.

[AS falſhood is no leſs natural to hereſy than violence, ſince it is itſelf only a lye, and the daughter of him who from the beginning of the world was a murderer and lyer;] χ the Arians made uſe of it at this time, reporting in Antioch, that S. Julian Saba, one of the moſt famous hermits of that time, was of their opinion: As this falſhood might have an ill effect upon a great many weak people, Flavian and S. Aphraates begg'd of him to come to Antioch, and for this purpoſe ſent Acacius to him who was afterwards Biſhop of Berea. ↓ Acacius took with him S. Aſterius his maſter and a diſciple of S. Julian, ω whom they brought from Edeſſa to Antioch, where every body came to ſee him in the caves near the mountain whither he retir'd. He fell ſick there, and after having obtain'd of God his own recovery and that of many others, α among whom was a man who could not walk but dragg'd himſelf along, whom he cur'd before the palace; β he came to the aſſembly which the Orthodox held in the artillery-ground, whither all the town flock'd deſiring to ſee him. γ He perform'd ſeveral other miracles, the moſt famous of which was curing the Count of the Eaſt. In his return to Edeſſa he went to Cyrus, where he found the principal of the Catholicks in trouble and affliction, becauſe the hereticks of the ſame city had brought one Aſterius a Biſhop of their own ſect to preach there, [who had been deſervedly depos'd in 359 by the [2] Semiarians. He muſt be diſtinguiſh'd without doubt from Aſterius the Sophiſt, who made himſelf ſo famous for his impiety in Conſtantine's reign,] but he had been tutor'd [as well as the other] in the tricks and fallacies of the ſophiſts: So that

[1] *α cripple that walks ſitting upon a bowl.*

[2] See §. 38.

χ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 24. p. 699. a, b. | v. Pat. c. 2. p. 780. c, d.
↓ v. Pat. p. 780. d. ω p. 782. c. α p. 783. a. β a. | his. l. 4. c. 24. p. 699. c. γ v. Pat. p. 783. a, b, c.

his

A. D. 372. his tongue was a dangerous weapon of the old ſerpent's; and it was very much fear'd, that the honeſt ignorant people would be impos'd upon by the falſe appearance of his eloquence and the ſnares of his captious ſophiſms. The Catholicks therefore having recourſe to the Saint, and deſiring him to aſſiſt them in this danger, δ he exhorted them to truſt in God, to join with him in deſiring aid, and to add ſtrength to their prayers by faſting and other acts of mortification. They follow'd this advice, and ſoon ſaw the effect of it: For Aſterius the day before the feſtival upon which he was to preach, was ſtruck with ſo malignant a diſtemper, that in one day he was carried off with all his artifices and ſophiſms, which ſerv'd for nothing afterwards but grounds for his condemnation and puniſhment; ε and being call'd, like Balaam, to curſe the people of God, he met with the ſame fatal deſtiny.

ζ The enemies to truth could not always endure in Antioch the force and power of Diodorus's words. They often baniſh'd him his country, [that is Antioch;] η and indeed, we find him this very year in Armenia with S. Meletius. θ They attempted likewiſe to make him loſe his head, becauſe of his freedom in defending the faith: But tho' they laid an infinite number of ſnares in his way, God always deliver'd him out of them. ι It is for this reaſon that S. Chryſoſtom calls him a living martyr, as well as for the continual mortification and auſterity of his life.

κ S. Baſil being affected with the misfortunes which the Church of Antioch ſuffer'd, wrote a letter to the Catholicks of that place to comfort them and ſtrengthen them in the expectation of the aſſiſtance of God. λ He would have gone himſelf to Antioch for this end, if he had not been detain'd by a tedious diſtemper: [[3] which may be referr'd to that which he had about the end of 373]

[3] See his title, §. 95, 96.

μ The neighbouring Churches of Antioch were treated in the ſame manner with their metropolis, and almoſt all over the Eaſt the Catholicks were turn'd out of the Churches, ν after having been depriv'd of their holy Prelates. [What happen'd with relation to S. Euſebius of Samoſata, is very

δ d. ε p. 784. a. ζ Fac. l. 4. c. 2. p. 155. η Baſ. ep. 187. p. 202. a. θ Fac. l. 4. c. 2. p. 155. ι p. 156, 157. κ Baſ. ep. 60. p. 88, 89. λ p. 88. d. μ Socr. l. 4. c. 17. p. 228. Soz. l. 6. c. 18. p. 660. a. ν Thdrt. l. 4. c. 16. p. 682. b.

famous,

famous, but we shall speak of it at its proper time; and we shall place nothing here but what we do not know the year it happen'd in, endeavouring to follow the order of the provinces. A.D. 372.

The Churches of Berea and Chalcis, both in Syria, suffer'd a great deal in the persecution, as may be seen by the answers which S. Basil sent to the letters they wrote to him about it.] ξ He assures the people of Berea, that the fame of their party had reach'd even his country, and had acquainted him with the crowns they had obtain'd by confessing the name of Jesus Christ, before they had written any thing to him about it. ο And as the Clergy had sent to him, besides their letters, Acacius the Priest [who was afterwards Bishop of Berea itself,] and who acquainted him with the strict fidelity of the Ecclesiasticks, the perfect union of the people with them, the courage and sincerity of the magistrates and principal men of the city; he thanks these Clergy for it in a particular letter, wherein he exhorts them to persevere to the end, and assures them that the example of their Church had fortify'd many others. π The courage of this Church, and particularly of the Council, [4] had already made some noise in Julian's reign, as may be seen by the complaints which this apostate makes of it. ρ We have a letter of the same Saint's to Theodotus Bishop of Berea, which is only a friendly compliment.

4 See the persecution under Julian, §. 40.

σ In the letter to the Church or rather the Clergy of Chalcis, he commends them for having shew'd no less unity among themselves, than strength in repelling their enemies. He says that the remembrance of their struggles and conflicts, and the letters they wrote to him, had not a little fortified him in the continual afflictions and trials of the persecution, which after having ravag'd all the provinces about, began likewise to enter Cappadocia. It seems that this letter was written about the end of 375 or shortly after, [5] when Demosthenes the Lieutenant in Pontus baniſh'd S. Gregory Nyssen, and did other injuries to the Catholicks of Cappadocia: and we shall see likewise, that the hermits about Chalcis and Berea suffer'd a great deal in 376 through the persecution of the Arians.

5 See S. Basil, §. 115, 116.

ξ Bas. ep. 298. p. 289. d. e. ο ep. 299. p. 290, 291.
π Juli. ep. 27. p. 157. ρ Bas. ep. 310. p. 301. σ ep. 297. p. 288, 289.

[7] These

A. D. 372. τ These heretics were so base as to set fire to a little hutt, where one Zeugmatius liv'd, who was an holy hermit of the diocese of Cyrus; and this they did to be reveng'd on him for his extraordinary courage. For tho' he was blind, yet he went about to several places confirming the sheep of Jesus Christ, and opposing the Arians. General Trajan had a new cell built for him, and took care to provide for all his other wants.

[S. Pelagius of Laodicea was at that time one of the greatest lights of Syria.] υ He was married when he was young; but upon the first day of his marriage, and when he was even in the nuptial bed, he persuaded his wife to embrace chastity, and to prefer fraternal friendship before the conjugal tie. Thus he preserv'd his purity, and obtain'd likewise the other vertues which should accompany so great a gift: and it was this which caus'd him to be rais'd by unanimous consent to the see of Laodicea φ in Syria, [either the greater which lies upon the sea near Antioch, [6] and of which George was still Bishop at the beginning of the year 360, or else the greater which was properly in Phœnicia Libani, if it is necessary to suppose that Apollinaris was the only Bishop of the other, [7] which point we examine in another place.] χ Philostorgius ascribes the election of S. Pelagius to Acacius of Cæsarea in Palestine, who had a mind to separate from the Arians after the Council of Constantinople in 360, and would raise defenders of the Consubstantiality to the episcopate. ↓ It is certain that he was Bishop as early as 363, in which year he assisted at the Council of Antioch, and there sign'd the Nicene creed. ω He assisted also at that of Tyanæ, which we have plac'd in 367; α and he likewise sign'd the letter, which the Easterns wrote at the beginning of this year 372 to the Prelates of Italy and Gaul.

β The fame of the vertues of this admirable Bishop had no effect upon Valens's hard-heartedness, but he banish'd him into Arabia, [where he stay'd in all probability till the end of the persecution.] γ S. Basil writes to him as to a Bishop of eminent vertue, and from whose prayers he ex-

6 See §. 93.

7 See the Apollinarians, Note 4.

τ Thdrt. l. 5. c. 25. p. 700. a, b. υ l. 4. c. 12. p. 675. a. φ Bas. ep. 311. p. 301. d. | Soz. l. 6. c. 4. p. 641. c. χ Philg. l. 5. c. 1. p. 78. ↓ Socr. l. 3. c. 25. p. 204. d. ω Soz. l. 6. c. 12. p. 652. b. α Bas. ep. 69. p. 108. b. β Thdrt. l. 4. c. 12. p. 675. b. γ Bas. ep. 331. p. 301, 302.

pected

pected great assistance. He expresses a great desire to go to see him, and even hopes he shall: [This hope is a great sign that S. Pelagius was not yet banish'd; as he was not before the end of 372, since S. Basil's letter could not be written sooner, as may be seen by the journey of Sanctissimus which is mention'd in it.] δ Theophanes seems to place his banishment in 374; [but he is no authority. A. D. 372.

After Valens's persecution he assisted in the year 379 8 at the great Council of Antioch, and 9 at the General Council of Constantinople in 381, in which year he, with Diodorus of Tarsus, was fix'd for the center of the Catholick communion in Syria. This is the last time we find him mention'd in history.] ε The Roman martyrology places him among the holy Confessors upon the 25th of March. ζ Elpidius succeeded him, who had been S. Meletius's companion, and was a perfect mirrour of his vertues. It was he who possess'd the great Pelagius's place, when S. Chrysostom was rais'd to the see of Constantinople [in 398,] η and even in the year 394, when he assisted at a celebrated Council of Constantinople. θ He defended S. Chrysostom's innocence in the year 404 with a great deal of courage.

8 See S. Meletius, §. 13.

9 See S. Gregory Nazianzen, §. 69—80.

SECTION CXIX.

Of S. Barses Bishop of Edessa: The courage of his people.

[ONE of the most illustrious Prelates that was banish'd for the faith through Valens's tyranny, was the great S. Barses.] ι It is believ'd that this is he who is nam'd Barsus, or another call'd Narsus in the superscription of the letter which the Easterns wrote this same year to the Bishops of the West, to desire them to assist them against the Ari-

δ Thphn. p. 52. c. ε Boll. 25. mars, p. 558. a. ζ Thdrt. l. 5. c. 27. p. 741. d. η Conc. t. 2. p. 1151. c. θ Pall. v. Chry. p. 79, 195. ι Bas. ep. 69. p. 108. b. | Blond. prim. p. 158. | Thdrt. n. p. 42. 2. b.

A.D. 372. ans; [of which we ſhall ſay nothing here, nor of what relates to this and other ſuch like letters, which make one of the principal parts of the hiſtory of S. Baſil.]

κ S. Barſes and S. Eulogius of whom we ſhall give an account preſently, had liv'd a ſolitary life a long time in the country about Edeſſa in Meſopotamia; and they were made Biſhops not of any city, ſays Sozomen, but only by way of honour in their monaſteries, as a reward of their vertue. [This is a little extraordinary, and does not agree with the rules of the Canons: Beſides, if we will not rely upon Sozomen, whoſe authority is inconſiderable enough in every thing, we ſhall find, that according to Theodorit, whoſe Biſhoprick was near Meſopotamia,] λ they were both Biſhops one after the other of Edeſſa [the metropolis of Oſrhoena in Meſopotamia.] μ S. Barſes is likewiſe call'd Biſhop of Edeſſa in the original inſcription of a letter which S. Baſil wrote to him; ν and in the body of the letter there is mention made of the people under him. ξ We have ſtill remaining ſome ſubſcriptions to Councils, where S. Eulogius takes the title of Biſhop of Edeſſa.

ο The perſecutions of Valens made S. Barſes famous not only in Edeſſa where he govern'd, and in the towns round about, but likewiſe in Phœnicia, Egypt, Thebaïs, by baniſhing him to which places they made the ſplendour of his piety ſhine the brighter, π and in general every where where there were any ſervants of Jeſus Chriſt. ρ He was firſt baniſh'd into the iſland of Aradus [upon the coaſt of Phœnicia,] where the miracles which he wrought by the apoſtolick grace with which he was fill'd, made him be viſited by a great number of people. σ S. Baſil who had a great reſpect for this Saint, would willingly have gone thither with the reſt, to embrace, ſays he, his true charity, and praiſe God who was glorified by his ſufferings. But as he could not viſit him in perſon, τ he did it by two letters which we have ſtill remaining, and ſent him ſome preſents. υ It ſeems by one of theſe letters, that S. Barſes had ſeveral

κ Soz. l. 6. c. 34. p. 691. c, d. c. | 681. d. | l. 5. c. 4. p. 709. b, c. p. 321. a.
λ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 14, 15. p. 678.
μ Baſ. ep. 326.
ν ep. 327. p. 322. a.
ξ Col. R. t. 1. p. 177.
ο Thdrt. l. 4. c. 14. p. 678. c.
π Baſ. ep. 327. p. 321. e.
ρ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 14. p. 678. e.
σ Baſ. ep. 327. p. 321. d.
τ ep. 326, 327. p. 321.
υ ep. 327. p. 322. a.

of

of his Eccleſiaſticks with him, who were baniſh'd for the faith as well as himſelf; [and we ſhall ſee in the ſequel how this happen'd.] A.D. 372.

φ Valens could not bear this concourſe of people's going to honour him whom he perſecuted. For which reaſon he baniſh'd him to Oxyrinchus a city of Egypt [in the province of Arcadia, famous for the piety of its inhabitants.] χ But his bed which was left at Aradus, ſupply'd the place of his perſon, and was very much honour'd there in Theodorit's time, becauſe a great many ſick people recover'd their health by lying down upon it.

ψ As the reputation of S. Barſes drew every body likewiſe to Oxyrinchus, Valens had this holy old man, who was worthy to dwell in heaven, carried to a caſtle called Pheno or Philo, which was upon the borders of the Empire near the countries of the Barbarians. ω He was certainly in Thebaïs, α ſince Theodorit ſays a little before, that S. Barſes had been likewiſe baniſh'd into this province. β He died in all likelihood at this place before the end of the perſecution.

γ Alexander of Hierapolis mentions him about the year 432, and S. Meletius and S. Euſebius [of Samoſata, as the moſt illuſtrious among the Biſhops and Confeſſors of this time.] Baronius has plac'd his feſtival in the Roman martyrology upon the 30th of January, thinking to follow the Greeks, δ who yet celebrate it upon the 15th of October, with a panegyrick taken * out of Theodorit. ε Bollandus is in doubt whether this is not the S. Barſes whoſe memory they celebrated upon the 28th of February, and whom they call Biſhop of Damas; but this may be a miſtake of the tranſcribers.

[The vertue of the paſtor could not appear more than in that of his ſheep, I do not ſay of the holy ſolitaries who liv'd about Edeſſa, as S. Ephraim and S. Julian Saba, but of all the people of the city. This is one of the moſt famous

φ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 14. p. 678. c. χ d. ψ c, d. | n. p. 36. 1. a. ω Boll. 30. jan. p. 1032. §. 6. α Thdrt. p. 678. c. β Thdrt. l. 4. c. 15. p. 681. d. γ Baluz. con. p. 853. δ Menæa, p. 187. ε feb. p. 381. | Boll. 30. jan. p. 1031. §. 3.

* excepting the name of Valens which they have chang'd into that of Valentinian.

A. D. 372. things that happen'd during this perſecution, and which has been taken notice of by all the hiſtorians.]

ζ Valens, [according to his uſual cuſtom,] having robb'd the Church of Edeſſa of its paſtor, put a wolf in his place; but all the people choſe rather to leave the city and meet in the country, η becauſe the Churches were taken from them [to be given to the Arians.] θ Valens finding them aſſembled there, when he came into this city to ſee the famous Church where the relicks of S. Thomas the Apoſtle were depoſited, was ſo enrag'd at it, that he even ſtruck the Prefect ι Modeſtus, κ becauſe he had not driven them from thence, as he had commanded him to do; λ and he order'd him to get all the archers and ſoldiers that were there together, to diſperſe the people with ſticks and clubs, and even arrows and ſwords if there was occaſion.

μ Modeſtus reſolv'd to do it the next day: ν But as he had ſome remains of humanity in him, he gave private notice to the Catholicks of the order he had receiv'd, that none of them might be at the aſſembly: and early in the morning he ſet out with a great deal of noiſe, tumult, and threatning, which he order'd his people to make on purpoſe, that he might find no body whom he ſhould be oblig'd to uſe roughly. But he was very much ſurpriz'd to ſee on the contrary, that the Orthodox ran in haſte and in greater numbers than ordinary to the aſſembly, as if they had been afraid they ſhould not die.

ξ Upon this he was at a ſtand, and conſider'd what he ſhould do; however he proceeded in his journey to the country; and as he was going along, ο a poor woman with a little child in her hand, went out of her houſe with ſo much precipitation, that ſhe did not give herſelf time ſo much as to ſhut her door, or put on her head-cloaths, and even made her way through the body of the officers that march'd before the Prefect, who was then croſſing the great place. π He could not imagine what ſhould make her preſs on ſo faſt; ρ and having order'd her to be brought

ζ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 15. p. 679. a. η Ruf. l. 2. c. 5. p. 254. θ p. 254. | Soz. l. 6. c. 18. p. 660. b. ι Soz. p. 660. b. | Thdrt. p. 679. b. κ Ruf. p. 254. λ Thdrt. p. 679. b. μ b ν Ruf. p. 254. | Soz. p. 660. c. | Socr. l. 4. c. 18. p. 228 c, d. ξ Soz. p. 660. c. ο Ruf. p. 254, 255. | Thdrt. p. 679. b. | Socr. p. 228. d. | Soz. p. 660. d. π Thdrt. p. 679. c. ρ c, d. | Ruf. | Socr. | Soz.

before

before him to know the truth, he found that she really hasted to go to the rest of the Faithful, because she had learnt that they were to be kill'd, and that she carried her son with her that he might likewise obtain the crown of martyrdom. It was easy for him to judge by the courage of a woman, what that of all the other Catholicks would be: So that he immediately order'd his people to turn back; and going to Valens, he gave him an account of what had happen'd, and shew'd him that he must resolve to let the Catholicks alone, or else murder them all, without getting any thing by it but the odium of having committed an unexampled piece of barbarity. His persuasions mitigated the Emperor's fury: σ And all the Faithful of Edessa had the honour of having merited the title of Confessors. A. D. 372.

τ It appears by a letter of S. Basil's, written about the end of 373, that Valens was pretty near Samosata at that time. [But it was customary with him to spend part of the campaign near the Euphrates.]

SECTION CXX.

The history of S. Eulogius and S. Protogenes Priests of Edessa, afterwards Bishops.

[THE other historians conclude here the history of what happen'd to the Faithful of Edessa: But Theodorit relates what follow'd, and his account is perfectly fine and full of edification.] υ Valens, says he, having agreed to what the Prefect desir'd of him in behalf of the Catholicks, order'd him however to seize the chief of them, that is the Priests and Deacons, and to make them communicate with the wolf, (this was the Arian Bishop whom he had put in S. Barses's place,) or else to turn them out of the city, and banish them a great way off. φ The chief of this illustrious body of Clergy was S. Eulogius, and Protogenes was the next after him. χ He had likewise liv'd a solitary life near Carræ.

σ Soz. p. 661. b. τ Bas. ep. 255. p. 253. d. υ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 15. p. 679. d. φ p. 680. d. χ Soz. l. 6. c. 33. p. 650. c.

A.D. 372. † The Prefect therefore having assembled them all, spoke to them with all the mildness that was possible, endeavouring to persuade them to obey the Emperor's orders, and represented to them that it was rash and fool-hardy for so small a number of people as they were, to oppose the will of an Emperor who govern'd so many nations with absolute power. As they all kept a profound silence, the Prefect address'd himself to Eulogius who was the foreman, and ask'd him why he made no answer. "Because, said "Eulogius, I did not think I was to answer when no "question was put to me. I have been speaking to you "a good while, reply'd the Prefect, and exhorting you to "resolve upon what is for your own interest. I thought, "answer'd Eulogius, that you directed your discourse to "all the assembly, and that I was not to answer alone "without the rest. But if you would know my private "opinion, I shall not hide it. Then the Prefect said to "him: Communicate then with the Emperor. Eulogius "answer'd him with a severe and handsome piece of wit; "What! is his Majesty a Bishop as well as an Emperor? The Prefect was stung with such a sarcastical reproach, and flew out into foul language against the good old man. To which he added: "I did not tell you, you block-"head, that the honour of the Priesthood belong'd to the "Emperor; I only advis'd you to communicate with those, "with whom his Majesty communicates." But Eulogius answering that they had a pastor, whose government they were under, and to whom they submitted, the Prefect seiz'd upon eighty Ecclesiasticks, and banish'd them all into Thrace.

As they went along, they were receiv'd with great regard: The inhabitants of the towns and villages through which they were to pass, went before them, and publickly extoll'd them as invincible defenders of the faith. But their envious adversaries informing the Emperor, that the banishment with which he thought to disgrace them, had made them be honour'd more than before, this prince had them separated, and sent them two and two, some into Thrace, others into Arabia, and the rest into Thebaïs. His orders were executed by people, who were so barbarous and inhuman as to separate those who were united by

† Thdrt. p. 679---682.

the

the straiteſt bonds of nature, for they parted near relations, A. D. 372.
and carried one brother to one place, and the other to another.

Eulogius and Protogenes were baniſh'd to Antinoüs in Thebais. They met there with a Catholick Biſhop, and join'd with him in the eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies. But having obſerv'd that the number of the Faithful was very ſmall, and asking the reaſon of it, they found to their ſorrow that the greateſt part of the inhabitants of this place were ſtill engag'd in the errors of Paganiſm. They were not content with lamenting this misfortune in the preſence of God, and with being fill'd with unſerviceable compaſſion for it, but they reſolv'd to labour ſeriouſly in their converſion. Eulogius ſhut himſelf up in a little cell, where he ſpent both day and night in praying for the ſucceſs of ſo holy an undertaking. Protogenes who had ſtudied polite learning, and could write ſhort-hand very well, ſet up a ſchool where he taught children ſhort-hand, and inſtructed them in the holy Scriptures. He dictated David's pſalms to them, and made them learn thoſe paſſages of the Apoſtles writings, which were the moſt uſeful and the moſt proper for them. One of his ſcholars being fallen ſick, he went to viſit him, took him by the hand, and cur'd him by the vertue of his prayer. This miracle making ſome noiſe, the fathers of the other children carried him home to their houſes, and deſir'd him to reſtore their ſick people to their health. But he told them, that he could not pray to God for their recovery, unleſs they firſt receiv'd baptiſm. The deſire they had to be cur'd, made them accept of this condition without any difficulty: And thus they receiv'd at the ſame time the health of their body and that of their ſoul.

When he had diſpos'd any one that was well in health to receive baptiſm, he carried him to Eulogius, knock'd at the door of his cell, deſir'd him to open it, and mark the perſon he brought with the ſeal of the Lord. And if Eulogius complain'd of being interrupted in his devotions, he anſwer'd him, that ſaving theſe people who renounc'd their errors, was a more neceſſary buſineſs. Every body admir'd him, for that tho' he had the gift of working miracles, and had brought ſo many people to the knowledge of God whom he had inſtructed in the myſteries of the faith; yet he look'd upon Eulogius as his ſuperior, and brought thoſe to him whom he had converted to God. There was no

A.D. 372. body who did not commend so great a piece of modesty, and who did not esteem his eminent vertue the more upon this account.

When the storm was laid, and they were recall'd from exile, all the people were in tears at parting with them; and the Bishop who was depriv'd of their assistance, regretted them more than any body else. When they were arriv'd in their own country, the care of the Church of Edessa was committed to Eulogius, the illustrious Barses its Bishop being gone to eternal life. Protogenes was plac'd in a barbarous uncultivated country, full of thorns, and where there was a great deal of work to do. For this is the character of the city of Carræ, of which place he was made Bishop, where there was still a great number of heathens. ω It is said, that S. Eulogius was consecrated Bishop by S. Eusebius of Samosata [before the Council of Antioch,] α at which he assisted about the month of August or September in 379.

[1] See S. Basil, §. 85. Note 59.

β It was he [1] who fixt S. Protogenes at Carræ, γ after the death of Vitus, who was famous for his piety [in S. Basil's time,] δ and who assisted likewise with S. Eulogius [in 381] at the Council of Constantinople. ε The Roman martyrology places Eulogius & Protogenes among the Saints, S. Eulogius upon the 5th of May, and S. Protogenes upon the sixteenth. ζ S. Abraham, whom Theodorit gives an account of, [in all likelihood succeeded S. Protogenes.]

SECTION CXXI.

Of Abraham Bishop of Batnæ: The state of Palestine.

[S. Basil has preserv'd to us the memory of the persecutions, which befell another Abram or Abraham Bishop of Batnæ,] η which was a strong and very wealthy place in

ω l. 5. c. 4. p. 709. d. α Col. R. t. 1. p. 177. β Thdrt. p. 709. c. γ Soz. l. 6. c. 33. p. 691. a. δ Thdrt. l. 5. c. 8. p. 713. b. | Conc. t. 2. p. 955. e. ε Sur. 15. nov. p. 345. §. 7. ζ Thdrt. v. Pat. c 17. p. 846 --- 850. η Amm. l. 14. p. 7.

Osrhoena,

Osrhoena, pretty near the Euphrates. θ He speaks of them in a letter which he sent him [about 373 or 376] by Sanctissimus, to excuse his not having written oftner to him, because that since the autumn [of the preceding year] he did not know where he was, some saying that he was at Samosata, others in the neighbouring country, some that he was near Batnæ itself, but that at last he had learnt that he liv'd at Antioch with Count Saturninus. [It is very easy to think, that this Prelate absconded because of the persecutions of the Arians.] ι His name is to be met with among those of the Easterns, who wrote to the Westerns with S. Meletius and S. Basil at the beginning of the year 372. κ He was likewise at the Council of Constantinople in 381. [As for Count Saturninus who carried him to his house, [r] he was in all likelihood the General of that name, whom Theodosius made Consul in 383, and upon whom Themistius wrote a panegyrick. A.D. 372.

[r] See Theodosius I. §. 14.

We pass now from Mesopotamia to Palestine, the state of which we learn in part from S. Epiphanius.] λ For this Saint tells us that one Gemellinus, Philip of Scythopolis μ Patrophilus's successor, ν Athanasius Bishop likewise of Scythopolis [after Philip,] ξ and many others, publish'd there openly and without any fear the most detestable of Arius's principles, ο maintaining publickly that the Son of God was a creature, that the Holy Ghost was one likewise, and had nothing common with the divine nature.

π They were not contented with opposing our faith in discourses, but they persecuted with the sword and wag'd open war against those who had the courage to defend it, and poison'd a great number of towns and countries with their doctrine. ρ S. Jerom speaks of [2] Dionysius Bishop of Diospolis, whom he calls a Confessor. [S. Cyril had been install'd Bishop of Jerusalem ever since the year 350 or 351. He had been turn'd out several times, and at last was in possession of his Church, according to the historians, in Julian's reign and the beginning of that of Valens. He was without doubt depriv'd of his see by Valens, as the rest were,] σ since S. Epiphanius observes that in the year 376

[2] See S. Jerom, §. 74.

θ Bas. ep. 315. p 304. ι ep. 69. p. 108. b. κ Conc. t. 1. p. 664. 2. c. λ Epi. 73. c. 37. p. 885. c, d. μ c. 24. p. 872. a. ν c. 37. p. 885. d. ξ c. 24. p. 872. a. ο c. 38. p. 886. a. π c. 37. p. 885. d. ρ Hier. ep. 61. p. 181. a. σ Epi. 66. c. 20. p. 637. d.

the

A.D. 372. the Church of Jeruſalem was govern'd by one Hilario, a man of no reputation upon the account of his being in communion with the Arians.

[John who ſucceeded S. Cyril, when he died in Theodoſius's reign, was in all likelihood at Jeruſalem during the perſecution by Valens, and follow'd the Biſhops who rul'd in that Church,] τ for S. Jerom reproaches him for that he had formerly been engag'd in Arianiſm, that he did not communicate at that time either with the Weſt, or with the Confeſſors who were baniſh'd for the faith; υ and that a Prieſt whoſe name was Theo, preaching in the Church and maintaining in his ſermon that the Holy Ghoſt was God, he ſtopt his ears, and ran out immediately with ſome others, as if he had been afraid of hearing blaſphemy. φ He was pretty young at that time, for when he was made Biſhop [in 386 or 387,] he was not above thirty years old.

[It was probably at the time that S. Cyril govern'd his Church, before this laſt expulſion,] χ that is in the beginning of Valens's reign, that Acacius Biſhop of Cæſarea in Paleſtine being dead, ψ he fixt Philumenus in his place. But Eutychius ω of Eleutheropolis, who follow'd one of the parties of the Arians, becauſe of S. Cyril, whoſe enemy he was, tho' he was orthodox in his heart, according to S. Epiphanius; [this] α Eutychius, I ſay, and thoſe of his faction, fix'd another Cyril in the ſee of Cæſarea who was call'd the Old. [It ſeems as if there was ſome incapacity in Philumenus, or ſome defect in his ordination,] ſince S. Cyril rais'd to the ſame throne Gelaſius his ſiſter's ſon.

β None of theſe three Prelates being able to execute their office, becauſe they oppos'd and deſtroy'd each other, [to which it ſeems we muſt add the perſecution of the Arians, who withſtood Gelaſius;] γ Euzoïus was fixt in this ſee [by the Arians,] of whoſe party he was, and whoſe belief he follow'd; and he enjoy'd it when S. Epiphanius wrote his book againſt the hereticks [in 376 or 377.] δ He had ſtudied with S. Gregory Nazianzen in the ſame city of Cæſarea under an orator nam'd Theſpeſius; and he wrote ſeveral pieces afterwards. ε He took a great deal of pains to recover the library of Cæſarea, which was

τ Hier. ep. 61. p. 163. b. υ p. 165. a. φ ep. 62. p. 186. b. χ Bar. 366. §. 32. ψ Epi. 73. c. 37. p. 885. c. ω c. 23. p. 870. c. | 871. b. α c. 37. p. 885. c. β c. γ b, c. δ Hier. v. ill. c. 113. p. 300. d. ε d. | ep. 141. p. 113. b.

chiefly

chiefly made up of Origen's works, collected together and given to the Church of Cæsarea by S. Pamphilus, [and dispers'd perhaps in the division between the three contenders.] ζ Euzoius found a great number of them again, and drew up a catalogue of them. ν He was at last turn'd out of the Church in Theodosius's reign, θ and Gelasius put in his place again. A.D. 372.

[Tho' Cappadocia enjoy'd a good deal of quiet in the midst of Valens's persecution, because of the care which God had visibly taken of S. Basil, yet S. Gregory his brother, whom he had made Bishop of Nyssa in the same province,] ι was near eight years without being able to see S. Macrina his sister, because of the several persecutions by the hereticks, who would not suffer him to live in any part of his own country. These eight years end at the conclusion of 379: [And so they must begin in this year at least. We shall see the persecution grow warm against him in the year 375.]

SECTION CXXII.

Peter is made Archbishop of Alexandria, and turn'd out by the Arians.

[THE course of our history brings us of itself to what pass'd in Egypt, where the cruelties of the Arians will furnish us with matter enough.] κ This province had continued in peace and tranquillity in the midst of the troubles of all the other Eastern ones, ever since the ardent affection of the people of Alexandria for S. Athanasius had oblig'd Valens to let him finish the last years of his life in peace. [1 But God remov'd him out of the world this year 373, according to that opinion which seems the best supported; and there is likewise a good deal of probability, that it was upon the 2d of May, upon which day his festival is celebrated.] A.D. 373.

1 See S. Athanasius, Notes 104, 105.

ζ ep. 141. p. 113. b. ν v. ill. c. 113. p. 300. d. θ c. 130. p. 303. a. ι Nyss. v. Macr. t. 2. p. 188. a. κ Soz. l. 6. c. 12. p. 654, 655. | Socr. l. 4. c. 20. p. 230. a.

Be-

A.D. 373. λ Before he died, when they spoke to him of his successor, he nam'd Peter, μ who was an excellent man, ν admirable for his piety and eloquence, ξ his companion in his misfortunes, ο who had shar'd with him in his fatigues, who had never left him either at Alexandria or in his journeys, who had run all sorts of hazards with him, π and whom his wisdom made no less venerable than his age and gray hair. ρ S. Gregory Nazianzen makes a fine panegyrick upon him and S. Athanasius together: [and Theodosius gave him a very great character,] σ when he order'd by his law of the 28th of February 380, that none should be look'd upon as Catholicks but those who follow'd the faith, which was preach'd by Pope Damasus, and by Peter of Alexandria, a man of apostolick holiness.

τ The vote which S. Athanasius had given him the first, was follow'd by that of all the Ecclesiasticks, magistrates, and persons of distinction; and all the people express'd their joy by publick acclamations. υ The neighbouring Bishops likewise assembled in haste; [for fear of being disturb'd by the cabals of the Arians;] and the holy hermits quitted their solitude, to help place Peter upon S. Athanasius's throne. φ Thus he was ordain'd according to the order and rules of the Holy Ghost.

[He wrote without doubt shortly after his election to the principal Bishops of the Church, as the custom was, and among others to S. Basil; and this seems to be the occasion of this Saint's writing to him his 320th epistle,] χ in which after having express'd his satisfaction for that the unity of the faith and the gift of the Holy Ghost had united him to him, tho' he had not had the happiness of seeing him and enjoying his conversation, he says that Peter having been rais'd by the great Athanasius, and having spent so much time with him, will not fail he hopes to follow his example, and walk in the steps of his piety; that he will succeed in the inclination this Saint had for him Basil; that he will acquaint him with what shall happen to

λ Ruf. l. 2. c. 3. p. 253. | Thdrt. l. 4. c. 17. p. 684. c. | Soz. l. 6. c. 19. p. 661. c. μ Thdrt. p. 684. c. ν Socr. p. 230. b. ξ Ruf. p. 253. ο Thdrt. p. 684. c, d. π Naz. or. 23 p. 418. a. ρ or. 24. p. 425. σ Cod. Th. 6. t. 1. l. 2. p. 4. τ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 17. p. 684. c. υ c. 18. p. 684. d. φ Naz. or. 23. p. 418. a. χ Bas. ep. 320. p. 312, 313.

him;

him; and that he will have for all the brethren the same bowels and solicitude as the blessed Athanasius had for all who truly lov'd the Lord. ⸸ Pope Damasus did the same thing, and sent a Deacon to Peter with letters of communion and consolation, [having perhaps already heard of the cruelties which the Arians committed upon his Church.] A D. 373.

ω For as soon as he was plac'd upon the episcopal throne, the Governor of the province, α nam'd Palladius, who profess'd idolatry openly, and had for a long time sought for an opportunity of making war with Jesus Christ, β was rejoic'd to find at last a way to satisfy his passion for his idols, under pretence of satisfying the Emperor's anger against the enemies to his doctrine. γ He assembled together therefore a great number of heathens and Jews, δ with whom he came to the Church of S. Theonas, as if he was going to attack the army of an enemy: ε and having surrounded it on all sides, he commanded Peter to go out of it, unless he had a mind to be turn'd out by force. [Afterwards] ζ he entred the Church with his troops, who committed there the most horrid outrages that can be imagin'd. η And it is not at all wonderful that Peter should say when he had a mind to give an account of these things in writing, he could not do it without putting a force upon himself, and after having shed a flood of tears. θ The Roman martyrology places those who were kill'd in this skirmish among the Saints upon the 13th of May.

[Peter is not the only evidence of so tragical a piece of history.] ι S. Gregory Nazianzen describes the same thing in a very pathetical manner, and relates some circumstances omitted by Peter; [because they happen'd perhaps after his letter was written. For S. Gregory does not distinguish between the several times, but joins what preceded Lucius's arrival with what follow'd it.] κ Rufinus, Socrates, and Sozomen have imitated him in this, speaking in general of cruelties committed upon the Catholicks at Alexandria: λ and Socrates blames Sabinus the Macedonian

⸸ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 19. p. 693. a. ω c. 18. p. 684, 685. α c. 19. p. 687. a. β c. 18. p. 685. a. γ a. δ c. 19. p. 687. b. ε c. 18. p. 685. a. ζ c. 19. p. 687 b.--688. d. η p. 687. b. θ Boll. 13. may, p. 206. b. ι Naz. or. 23. p. 417, 418. c. | or. 25. p. 432, 434. κ Ruf. l. 2. c. 23. p. 253. | Socr. l. 4. c. 21. p. 230. c, d. | Soz. l. 6. c. 19. p. 661. c. d. λ Soer. l. 4. c. 22. p. 231. b.

historian

A.D. 373. historian for not having mention'd them, that he might conceal the crime and shame of his friends the Arians.

μ The sacrilegious profanations which were committed in the Church, oblig'd Peter to leave it ν privately. Theodorit seems to have thought he immediately took ship, and [2] Note 91. went to Rome. [2 But it is probable that before he did it,] ξ he continued some time conceal'd in several places, [at Alexandria or in the neighbouring country,] endeavouring still to govern his people, tho' privately: [and it was pretty probably at this time, that imitating what S. Athanasius had done thirty two years before, he wrote the letter from whence we have chiefly taken the account we have given of the sufferings of the Church of Alexandria.] ο It was sent to all the Churches. π Theodorit has preserv'd us a great part of it, ρ having left out the beginning and conclusion because of its length.

SECTION CXXIII.

Euzoïus brings Lucius an Arian to Alexandria to be Bishop: Lucius raises there a terrible persecution against the Catholicks.

σ IN the mean while, the Arians, whose hopes were rais'd by S. Athanasius's death, having immediately given notice of this accident to Valens, who was then at Antioch; Euzoïus the Arian Bishop of that city thought it was best not to lose any time, but to go himself to Alexandria, and put Lucius in possession of the Churches, τ who had bought this bishoprick with money as if it had been a secular post, instead of being rais'd to this dignity by an assembly of orthodox Bishops, by the suffrage of the Catholick Ecclesiasticks, and by the desire of the faithful people, according to the order and Canons of the Church.

μ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 19. p. 688. d. ν c 18. p. 685. b. ξ Combf. act. p. 83. ο Socr. l. 4. c. 22. p. 231. b. π Thdrt. l. 4. c. 19. p. 687--694. ρ c. 18. p. 686. d. σ Socr. l. 4. c. 21. p. 230. c. τ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 19. p. 688.

υ This

υ This Lucius was certainly as ill made in his body, as he was corrupted in his soul. φ He was of Alexandria, and had been there made Priest by George, χ in whose place the Arians had immediately substituted him for their chief, ↓ yet without consecrating him Bishop. ω They endeavour'd to get their choice confirm'd by Jovian, who [1] made a jest both of him and them. α He was consecrated afterwards, either at Antioch or at some other place out of Egypt: β but he was condemn'd and rejected more than once by all the orthodox Prelates of the Church. γ He often desir'd of Valens to be put in possession of the see of Alexandria, but the fear of raising a disturbance in that city, hindred his obtaining any thing as long as S. Athanasius liv'd. A.D. 373.

[1] See S. Athanasius, §. 103, 104.

δ This Saint therefore being dead, ε Euzoïus brought Lucius thither ζ with Valens's consent, and with orders from him to Palladius the Governor. They had with them, to help them in the execution of their designs, a great number of soldiers, commanded by Count Magnus [1] the Lord Treasurer, who having burnt the Church of Berytus when Julian was Emperor, had like to have lost his head for it in Jovian's reign. η These were the people who guarded Lucius upon his entry, instead of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, who should have perform'd this office, instead of crowds of people, instead of monks who should have gone before him singing hymns taken out of the holy Scriptures. θ The heathens likewise honour'd the solemnity, by bestowing upon him in his own hearing the blessing of Serapis, and by praising him for not acknowledging the Son of God; which he seem'd to look upon as matter of joy rather than of horror.

[1] *largitionum comes.*

ι He arriv'd a few days κ after the slaughter and violences committed in the Church of S. Theonas: and the inhumanities which he added, prov'd but too plainly, as Peter says, that he had the actions and rage as well as the name of a wolf according to the Greek language, λ and that he

υ Ath. coll. 3. p. 26. b. φ Soz. l. 6. c. 5. p. 643. a. χ l. 4. c. 7. p. 603. b. | Socr. l. 3. c. 4. p. 173. c. ↓ Ath. coll. 1,3 p. 27. c. | 29. b. ω p. 27--29. α Epi. 68. c. 10. p. 726. c. β Thdrt. p. 689. e. γ Epi. p. 726. c, d. δ Thdrt. p. 698. a. ε Socr. l. 4. c. 21. p. 230. c. d. ζ Thdrt. p. 689. a, b. η a. θ c, d. ι c. 18. p. 685. b. κ c. 19. p. 688. d. λ Naz. or. 23. p. 417. b.

deserv'd

A. D. 373. deserv'd the titles which S. Gregory Nazianzen gives him, of new plague and new scourge of Egypt, keeper of wolves, thief and robber who climbs over the walls of the sheep-fold, disturber and destroyer of reason, furious beast, new Arius, stream fuller of impiety than the spring from whence it flows.

[The Church of Egypt which alone had enjoy'd peace, when all the rest were persecuted,] μ felt at this time, more than any other Church, all the severities of the persecution, and was every day oppress'd with new troubles. ν The inthronement of Lucius could not be perform'd till after all the Ecclesiasticks were turn'd out. ξ He spar'd neither Church, nor city, nor laity, nor Clergy, nor Bishops. ο For as soon as he was come, he endeavour'd to seize upon the Churches; but the people opposing him, it was charg'd as a crime upon the Ecclesiasticks and the virgins, as if they had rais'd a sedition. The Arians therefore committing their barbarities all over the city, as the enemies to the Empire might have done, oblig'd the Catholicks to save themselves by flight, and took some as they were making their escape, whom they loaded with chains and carried to prison; out of which they were never taken but to make them suffer most horrid torments: For they tore some with iron nails and leather straps, they burnt others with lighted torches, so that it was a miracle if they had any breath left after undergoing such rigorous punishments. And there was no body who would not have chose to die, or at least to be sent into banishment, rather than be expos'd to these tortures.

π They consider'd neither the age [of infants,] nor the weakness of old people, nor the charity [and compassion] of the people [towards them whom they us'd so inhumanly.] They whipt, they tore, they banish'd people, they robb'd them of their goods and mony, without any respect to men or fear of God. ρ They banish'd some Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, they beheaded others in the middle of Alexandria, they expos'd some to the fury of beasts, they massacred virgins, and kill'd many others in divers manners.

σ It was by these methods that Arianism became powerful and formidable. τ It was by these cruelties that it

μ Soz. l. 6. c. 19. p. 661. d. ν Socr. l. 4. c. 21. p. 230. d. ξ Epi. 68. c. 10. p. 626. d. ο Soz. p. 661. d. π Bas. ep. 71. p. 115. c. ρ Epi. 68. c. 10. p. 726. d. σ d. τ Soz. p. 662. a.

made

made itself master of the churches of Alexandria: and A. D. 373.
shew'd at the same time the small number of its followers. υ For the people having been fed with the doctrine of S. Athanasius, and seeing that another sort of meat was offer'd them, left the ecclesiastical assemblies. But Lucius being supported by the worshippers of idols who serv'd for guards to him, had some of them lash'd severely, put the rest to flight, and even rifled the houses like a robber.

φ This is perfectly well describ'd in Peter's letter; χ in which he gives us an account of the glorious confession of nineteen Priests and Deacons, whom Count Magnus had seiz'd at the same time that he entred Alexandria with Lucius; ψ he tells us of the speech worthy of himself which he made to oblige them to embrace Arius's tenets, which were maintain'd, as he said, by Lucius; ω the courageous answer which these champions for the truth made him; α the patience with which they suffer'd for many days imprisonment, scourgings, and tortures; β the cruelty with which he condemn'd them at a second trial, where he appear'd with his naked sword in his hand, to be banish'd to Heliopolis in Phœnicia, where the inhabitants could not so much as bear the name of Jesus Christ, and this at the desire of Jews and heathens whom they had hir'd to roar and bellow against them; γ the dispatch with which he had this barbarous sentence executed, not giving the Confessors time either to take any refreshment, or lay in any provision for their voyage, or even to stay till the sea which was rough and dangerous then, should become calm; lastly he gives an account of the tears, and sighs, and protestations of all the people who were enrag'd at so barbarous a piece of cruelty. δ But these very tears were look'd upon as criminal by the persecutors. Palladius the Prefect forbad any weeping: and having seiz'd upon and imprison'd twenty three persons upon this account, most of whom were holy inhabitants of the deserts, he had them whipt, tore their flesh, examin'd them upon the rack, and afterwards sent them to work, some at Pheno, some at Proconnesus; ε the first of which places is a copper-mine in Palestine, ζ and the other an island in Propontis upon the coast of

υ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 18. p. 685. b. φ b. χ c. 19. p. 689. d. ψ p. 690. a, b. ω c, d. | 691. a, b. α p. 691. b, c. β c, d. | 692. a, c. γ p. 692. a, c. δ p. 692, 693. ε p. 693. b. Eus. de Pal. c. 7. p. 328. c.

A. D. 373. Helleſpont and Bithynia, where there were ſome marble quarries. η They were ſoon follow'd by the Deacon who had brought the Pope's letters to Peter: for he was likewiſe ſent by ſea to Pheno, after having ſuffer'd unheard of cruelties. θ The very children were not exempt from puniſhments; and ſome of them dying upon the rack, their bodies were left expos'd to the beaſts, notwithſtanding all that their parents and the whole city could do to obtain the liberty of burying them. ι They even beheaded thoſe who join'd with the fathers of theſe children in grieving for them. κ In ſhort all the city was in tears; and it might be ſaid as formerly, that there was not an houſe where there was not one dead in it.

λ There were ſome Catholick Eccleſiaſticks, and ſome very pious monks, who had the courage to go to the Emperor and lay their complaints before him, and proteſt againſt the violences which the hereticks committed; but the Arians prepoſſeſs'd the Emperor againſt them, and had them ſent from Antioch where they were, to Neocæſarea in Pontus. [It ſeems, theſe were ſome Eccleſiaſticks of Alexandria, who went to Antioch to demand juſtice for the violences done in their city.] μ Piammon in Caſſian ſays, that during Lucius's intruſion he was ſent to carry the alms of the Faithful to the Confeſſors of Egypt and Theba's, who were baniſh'd to the mines of Pontus and Armenia.

SECTION CXXIV.

Peter retires to Rome: Several Biſhops of Egypt are baniſh'd into Paleſtine.

[THERE is no doubt but Peter would have ſuffer'd death as well as ſo many others who did upon his account, if he had not ſav'd himſelf by flight.] ν Socrates and Sozomen ſay, that at firſt he was taken by the Arians, and kept a priſoner for ſome time, but that he found a way to eſcape, and went to Rome. [The letter which he wrote, ſays nothing expreſly contrary to this. But it is

η Thdrt. p. 693. a, b. θ b. ι c. κ d. λ p. 694. c. μ Caſſ. coll. 18. c. 7. p. 687. ν Socr. l. 4. c. 21, 22. p. 230. d. | 231. b. | Soz. l. 6. c. 19. p. 662. a.

much

much that it does not mention it at all. For it is not probable, that there is any thing of it in that part which Theodorit has omitted, since without doubt he would not have forgot so considerable a particular, or at least he would have mention'd it in the abridgment he made of this letter: And if it is said, contrary to Socrates's express evidence, that the letter might be written before, it is however difficult to get over the objection concerning Rufinus, who was in Egypt at this very time, and says nothing at all about this imprisonment: So that this point must be at least lookt upon as very doubtful. A. D. 373.

But what is certain,] ξ is that Peter after having spent some time in escaping sometimes from one place, sometimes from another, ο retir'd at last to Rome: π Where shewing, instead of dead bodies, a garment all over blood, this eloquent tho' silent accusation of the injustice of his persecutors brought tears from every body, and made the West lament the misfortunes which the East had suffer'd. ρ He found in the Roman Church the assistance which he expected; [that is, a safe retereat as long as the violence of his enemies lasted, pity for the misfortunes of his Church, his dignity acknowledg'd, the person anathematiz'd who possess'd his place, and all the other offices which the misfortunes of the times allow'd to be paid him.]

σ It seems, that S. Basil maintain'd a constant correspondence with him by letters, τ till having neglected to inform him of some indignity that was done him, Peter complain'd with the friendship of a brother, [that he had not been equally kind in acquainting him with every thing, whether of consequence or no, that happen'd to him.]

υ A short time after Lucius's arrival, there came an edict from the Emperor, to drive out of Alexandria and all Egypt those who follow'd the Consubstantiality, with an order to the Governor of Egypt to send soldiers after all whom Lucius should name: φ After which Euzoïus being satisfied with having made his designs succeed as he pretended, return'd to Antioch.

[It was perhaps to make an advantage of this edict,] χ that the Arians not being satisfy'd with the cruelties

ξ Combf. act. p. 88. ο Naz. or. 23. p. 418. d. & alii. π d. ρ p. 419. a. σ Bas. ep. 321. p. 314. b, c. τ p. 313. c. υ Socr. l. 4. c. 21. p. 230. d. Soz. l. 6. c. 19. p. 662. a. φ Soz. p. 662. b. χ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 19. p. 693. d.

A. D. 373. which they had committed at Alexandria, made the Bishops of the province feel them, ψ under the authority of Count Magnus. They condemn'd some of them to serve in the Council, and gave others as bad treatment as was possible. ω They banish'd eleven of them to Diocæsarea, which was a town inhabited by Jews, [and therefore probably in Palestine,] α where there was a Diocæsarea which was destroy'd about the year 352 by Gallus, because of the revolt of the Jews who dwelt there. β And indeed S. Basil speaking of the same Confessors, says that they were banish'd into the middle of Palestine.

γ The names of these Saints were Eulogius, Adelphus, Alexander, Ammonius, Arpocratio, Isaac, Isidore, Annubian, Pitimus, Euphrates, and Aaron. δ Peter their Archbishop says, that they had suck'd in piety with their milk; that they had always liv'd in solitude from their infancy to their being pretty far advanc'd in years; that they had overcome voluptuousness and pleasure by the [laborious] exercises [of penance;] that they had often conquer'd devils; that they preach'd the Catholick faith with invincible courage, and by the strength of their discourses refuted the impiety of the Arian heresy. ε S. Basil writing to three of them, Eulogius, Alexander, and Arpocratio, [and probably to all the rest,] blesses Providence, which made the most unfortunate accidents turn to the advantage of the Church, and had brought them from Egypt to the middle of Palestine, to contribute to the salvation of many souls, by opposing Apollinarius, as we shall see they did.

ζ Palladius speaks of these holy Confessors who were banish'd to Diocæsarea in Palestine; but he makes their number a dozen, [because they had added some body to it.] He joins with the Bishops one Pambo and one Paphnutius, [who might be some other Confessors, not Bishops.] For he tells us that besides the Prelates, there were a hundred and twenty six Priests or other Ecclesiasticks and hermits banish'd to this place: η and we have likewise some passages of a letter which Peter of Alexandria wrote to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, banish'd to Diocæsarea in

ψ p. 694. a. ω a, b. α Socr. l. 2. c. 33. p. 128. b. | Soz. l. 4. c. 7. p. 545. b. | Hier. chr. β Bas. ep. 293. p. 283. a. γ Epi. 72. c. 11. p. 842. d. δ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 19. p. 694. a, b. ε Bas. ep. 193. p. 283. ζ Laus. c. 117. p. 1032. a. η Fac. l. 11. c. 2. p. 469.

Va-

Valens's reign. θ S. Pambo Priest of Nitria [1] was banish'd in 376. A.D. 373. [1] See his title.

ι The Governor of Palestine would not allow any charitable office to be paid them. So that S. Melania who thought herself happy in assisting them with her estate, was forc'd to put on the habit of a servant, to go to them and serve them in the night-time. The Governor who did not know her, had her brought before him; but when he was inform'd of her birth and quality from her own mouth, he excus'd himself mightily to her, and gave her full liberty to visit the holy Confessors.

SECTION CXXV.

Of S. Isidore of Hermopolis; and of the blessed Dorotheus, who was martyr'd at Alexandria.

[AS to what we find of each of these Confessors in particular,] κ Adelphus Bishop of Onuphis [1] [in Ægyptus prima,] λ Ammonius of Pacneumonis and of a canton call'd Elearchia, and Paphnutius of Sais [in Egyptus prima,] are nam'd among those who had already been banish'd or depriv'd in Constantius's reign, and had assisted at the Council of Alexandria in 362. μ Eulogius is also among those who were oblig'd to fly in Constantius's reign, [2] μ We have likewise a letter from S. Athanasius to Adelphus a Bishop and Confessor. [1] τῆ λυχνων. [2] See S. Anthony, §. 17.

ν Palladius says that the blessed Isidore the Confessor was Bishop of Hermopolis, [not of the greater,] ξ which was in Thebais, ο where it is thought Jesus Christ retir'd with the Virgin and S. Joseph; π but of the less [near Alexandria,] having succeeded Dracontius and preceded Dioscorus.

θ Ruf. l. 2. c. 4. ι Laus. p. 1032. b, c. κ Ath. de Ant. p. 580. b, c. λ ad sol. p. 859. a. μ ad Adel. t. 1. p. 155. ν Laus. c. 117. p. 1031. c. ξ Boll. 2. jan. p. 1085. ο Laus. c. 52. p. 977. π Boll. 14. may, g. p. 71. b.

A. D. 373. rus. [[3] The mountain of Nitria, so famous for the solitaries who liv'd there, belong'd to his diocese; which was the reason that] ρ Melania saw him at Nitria when she came thither [about 367;] and it appears that he was Bishop as early as that time. σ S. Paula likewise found there afterwards, [about the year 387,] the holy and venerable Bishop Isidore the Confessor. [He died after 391,] τ for that year Dioscorus his successor was only Priest of Nitria. υ The Roman martyrology places his festival upon the second of January.

[3] See S. Ammon of Nitria, §§ 1, 2, 4, 5.

[It is observable, that] φ Palladius speaking at the same time of him and several others who were banish'd in Valens's reign, χ yet gives the title of Confessor to none but him. [This may incline us to believe that he acquir'd it in a particular manner, and perhaps before the arrival of Melania; (for it is of that Palladius is speaking in that place:) and thus it was either under the heathens, it not being difficult to think he was old enough for that, or at least in Constantius's time. But if he had been a Confessor so early, he was a second time in Valens's reign. ψ For as Palladius places one Isidore at the head of those whom this prince banish'd to Diocæsarea in Palestine, among whom there were twelve Bishops, [he must without doubt be understood only of that Isidore whom he was just before speaking of, that is the Bishop of Hermopolis, the rather because] ω it is certain that there was one Isidore an Egyptian Bishop banish'd to Diocæsarea.

α Palladius gives Ammonius [4] a surname, which seems to intimate that he had but one ear. [I do not know whether he means Ammonius, [5] one of the tall brethren famous in the history of S. John Chrysostom, who cut off his own ear some years after this, that he might not be made a Bishop, or whether he who was Bishop in Valens's reign, had done the same thing, but in vain.]

[4] παρώτιον.

[5] See S. Chrysost. §. 67. | Theophilus of Alexandria, §. 17.

β He speaks in another place of a Bishop of Antinopolis who was banish'd, or rather of another Bishop banish'd to Antinopolis, [6] and probably of himself who was banish'd for the affair of S. Chrysostom. I do not know whether it

[6] See his title, §. 5.

ρ Laus. c. 177. p. 1031. c, d. σ Hier. ep. 27. p. 175. a.
τ Boll. 14. may, p. 71. b. | Laus. c. 13. p. 915. c. υ Boll. 2. Jan. p. 84. Laus. p. 1032. a. χ p. 1031. c. ψ p. 1032. a. ω Fac. l. 4. c. 2. p. 158. | Epi. 72. c. 11. p. 842. d.
α Laus. p. 1032. a. β c. 139. p. 1041. d.

is

is to these eleven Bishops banish'd to Diocæsarea, that we must refer] γ what Socrates says of those who were banish'd in Valens's reign upon a mountain, or as he says to the mountain. δ Sozomen says, that all the prelates in general who were enemies to Arianism, were order'd to be banish'd. ε Ammonius a solitary at Canopia near Alexandria, not being able to see any longer so many troubles as the Catholicks suffer'd every day, and Peter being oblig'd to fly and hide himself, went to visit the holy places of Jerusalem, and afterwards the holy mountain of Sinaï, where he was an eye-witness of the massacre of several solitaries by the Saracens: [ζ which happen'd in all likelihood upon the 28th of December this same year.] A.D. 373. ζ See S. Paul. Isaiah, &c. Note 2.

ζ S. Jerom mentions a Bishop [of Egypt] whose name was Paul, who for having confess'd Jesus Christ was all torn with scourges, felt the horror of the prison, the trouble of banishment, the labour of the mines. η And yet after this he was depos'd and banish'd out of Egypt by Theophilus, as we hope to give an account in another place.

[This persecution which began in 373, under the Prefect Palladius, continued still under Tatian,] θ who we find was Prefect of Egypt the second time [at the end of] the year 373, and the following years till 377. ι It is observ'd that under his government, and after the death of S. Athanasius, Valens banish'd Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Monks, that he put several Christians upon the rack, and even burnt some. κ An ancient author places likewise under Tatian, and it seems in 375, the martyrdom of the blessed Dorotheus, whom the Arians caus'd to be expos'd to the beasts at Alexandria in the amphitheatre upon the ninth of October, λ on which day the Greeks celebrate the memory of one S. Dorotheus Bishop of Tyre in Diocletian's time, and martyr'd under Julian; [which is insupportable.] Theophanes speaks of him of Alexandria. [Excepting this particular, we do not find that he is known.] μ Eutychius takes notice of one Theodorus at Alexandria in Valens's

γ Socr. l. 4. c. 36. p. 254. a. δ Soz. l. 6. c. 31. p. 688. a.
ε Combef. act. p. 88, 89. ζ Hier. in Ruf. l. 3. c. 5. p. 238. c.
η p. 237. b. θ Idat. app. p. 84. ι Suid. ου. p. 347. d, e.
κ Idat. app. p. 84. | Thphn. p. 56. c. d. λ Canis. t. 2. | Ugh. t. 6. p. 1098. μ Euty. p. 491.

A. D. 373 time; but he describes his martyrdom in another manner: ν and the Greeks celebrate upon the 12th of September the
8 &c. memory of one S. Theodorus a Bishop, martyr'd [8] in the same city, who according to what they say, suffer'd when the government was in the hands of the Pagans.

SECTION CXXVI.

The history of S. Melas: S. Basil writes to the Church of Alexandria.

ξ AMong the Egyptian Bishops who were famous for their constancy and resolution in the persecution under Valens, history makes honourable mention of Melas Bishop of Rhinocurura or Rhinocolura, a considerable town enough, of which we say nothing here in particular, because Bollandus has given a pretty large and exact account of it. ο Some place it in Palestine, others in Egypt; because it is upon the confines of both those countries. π However we find it belong'd to the patriarchate of Alexandria: ρ and Sozomen when he is treating of the great men of Egypt, mentions Melas, and after him begins to speak of those of Palestine. Ammianus reckons it likewise in Egypt.

σ This city was famous at that time for the piety of many Saints, who were born in it. τ Among others they take notice of S. Melas, who being sanctify'd from his youth by the exercises of the solitary life, govern'd the Church there in Valens's reign in the quality of Bishop; υ Solon his brother, who of a merchant became a monk, improv'd mightily under his direction, φ and succeeded him in the episcopate; and Dionysius who likewise govern'd a monastery on the north side of the city. This Church was so happy as to be govern'd thus by Saints till the reign of Theodosius the younger, and the regulations which they settled continually produc'd some excellently pious men. The Eccle-

ν Ugh. t. 6. p. 1068. | Menæa, p. 173. ξ Boll. 16. jan. p. 15.
ο p. 15. §. 1. π Geo. sac. ρ Soz. l. 6. c. 31, 32. p. 688, 689.
σ c. 31. p. 687. d. τ p. 688. a. υ c. φ a, c, d.

siasticks

ſiaſticks lodg'd, eat, and did every thing there in common. A.D. 373.
χ S. Iſidore of Peleſium beſtows great commendations upon one Hermogenes a Biſhop ; ψ and it is thought, that this is Hermogenes of Rhinocurura, who aſſiſted at the Council of Epheſus in 431.

ω To return to S. Melas : They ſay that as orders were given to baniſh all the Prelates who were enemies to Arianiſm, the people who came to execute this order againſt him, found him trimming the lamps of the Church, and putting cotton in them, in a coat all greas'd with oil, and a girdle over it ; ſo that one would have taken him for the meaneſt of all the ſervants. They ask'd him where the Biſhop was, to which he anſwer'd, [as S. Phocas an illuſtrious martyr of Sinope had done formerly,] that he was there, and that he would carry them to him. In the mean time as they were very much tir'd with their journey, he brought them into the palace, gave them ſomething to eat, and ſerv'd them himſelf at the table. When they had done, and he had waſh'd his hands, he told them that he was the very perſon they ſought. They were very much ſurpriz'd ; and being affected with ſuch wonderful behaviour, they own'd to him that they were come to take him, but that he might make his eſcape if he pleas'd : this he refus'd to do, ſaying that he rejoic'd to ſuffer the ſame uſage as was given thoſe who held the ſame faith. α The Church honours this heroick action upon the 16th of January.

[The Church of Egypt being ſupported by ſo many illuſtrious Prelates, certainly deſerv'd the encomiums which S. Gregory Nazianzen beſtows upon it,] β of being the moſt excellent, the moſt firmly attach'd to Jeſus Chriſt, the moſt zealous for piety; in a word, of being worthy of thoſe two illuſtrious Fathers, Athanaſius and Peter. γ He ſays, that it was the Egyptians who above all other people had propagated the word of truth, who had learnt to know it and to preach it in its purity, and who among all the orthodox made it bear the greateſt quantity of fruit. [Theſe praiſes do not belong only to the Prelates and heads of this Church. We have ſeen already, that the Prieſts and other Catholicks of Alexandria had ſuffer'd for the faith : and we have

χ Iſi. P. l. 5. ep. 358. p. 666. e. ψ Boll. 4. feb. p. 781. e.
ω Soz. l. 6. c. 31. p. 688. α Boll. 16. jan. p. 15. §. 4. β Naz. or. 24. p. 426. b. γ p. 424. b.

ſtill

A. D. 373. ſtill ſome admirable things to ſay of the holy hermits of this Church. But as S. Jerom does not place the perſecution againſt them before the year 375, we reſerve this point for another opportunity.]

δ The noiſe of ſo many cruelties committed at Alexandria and all over Egypt, being come to S. Baſil's ears, ε he was almoſt out of his ſenſes, ſo much was he ſeiz'd with wonder and aſtoniſhment; and he was in doubt whether this perſecution was not that of Antichriſt. He continued a pretty while as it were ſtunn'd with ſo ſtrange a piece of news, without being able to ſet down to write upon ſo melancholy a ſubject. But at laſt he did about the end of 373, and ſent a letter to the Alexandrians, ζ wherein he expreſſes a great deal of grief for not being able to come himſelf and comfort them, and embrace theſe couragious combatants for the faith.

[Before we leave Egypt, we muſt obſerve that the holy hermit [1] Moſes being to be made a Biſhop at the deſire of Mavia the Queen of the Saracens, he would not receive impoſition of hands from Lucius, but put him to publick ſhame by charging him with ſo many impieties and cruelties as he had committed againſt the faithful ſervants of Jeſus Chriſt. But as his ordination was neceſſary to ſtrengthen the peace with the Saracens, Valens was oblig'd to let [2] it be perform'd by the Biſhops whom he had baniſh'd.]

[1] See his title.

[2] &c.

SECTION CXXVII.

The ſtate of the Churches of the Weſt in 373 *and* 374: *The Council of Illyricum condemns the Arians; writes to the Churches of Aſia.*

[WE know little of what happen'd this year out of Egypt relating to Arianiſm. Euſtathius of Sebaſtia in Armenia, who had ſo often chang'd his faith, or his

δ Baſ. ep. 71. p. 115. a. ε d, e. ζ p. 116. c.

party,

party, [1] broke with S. Basil, and by consequence with all the Catholicks of the East, whom he was in so much haste to join in 366 and 367. But he thought that this rupture was necessary for him to do his business at Court, where the Catholicks were hated, and where by consequence S. Basil could not be lov'd,] η tho' God always protected him against the attempts which the Arians continually made upon him. θ They even obtain'd [2] of Valens, that he should be deliver'd up to their discretion: but God soon made him change his mind. ι They gave out likewise that they would make him come to Antioch under pretence of some accommodation; and the Catholicks would have been glad to have seen him there speaking to Valens at the head of the remnant of the orthodox Bishops of Syria. [But I do not find that any of these designs were put in execution. A. D. 373. [1] See S. Basil, §. 90-93. [2] See S. Basil, §. 40, 41.

What was more unfortunate to the Church,] κ was [3] that after the death of the Bishop of Tarsus who was a Catholick, (this was in all likelihood Silvanus who was reunited to the Church in the year 366,) the Orthodox not being quick enough in giving him a good successor, the hereticks were beforehand with them, and plac'd there a wretch whose name we do not know: λ So that the Catholicks [who would not acknowledge him,] were govern'd only by Priests, [till Diodorus who was so famous at Antioch, was ordain'd Bishop of the place about the year 379. [3] ibid. §. 60.

I do not know whether the same misfortune did not likewise happen to the Church of Ancyra, which about this year lost Athanasius its [4] Bishop, who was very firm to the Catholick faith.] μ His successor who is not nam'd, continued some time without stirring one way or other; [but he might possibly let himself be carried away at last with the torrent of Arianism:] ν For it appears, that Galatia was not in communion with S. Basil [in the year 375. About the end of the same year we shall find a Council of the Arians at Ancyra,] ξ and the Bishops of Galatia in general pass for Arians. [4] ibid. §. 98.

ο The Church of Suedra in Pamphylia, which had been settled in the Catholick faith by the epistles of S. Athanasius and another Bishop nam'd Proclian, endeavour'd at this A. D. 374.

η Bas. ep. 7. p. 50. a. θ ep. 58, 59. p. 86. d. | 87. d, e. ι ep. 241, 342. p. 244. e. | 335, 336. κ ep. 5. p. 48, 49. | ep. 257. p. 255. λ ep. 203, 204. p. 222, 223. μ ep. 7. p. 50. b. ν ep. 75. p. 131. c. ξ ep. 264 p. 263. b. ο Epi. anc. p. 2. c.

time

A.D. 374. time to be confirm'd in it more and more by desiring S. Epiphanius's instructions against the false reasonings of the Arians, and particularly of the Macedonians. π It was upon this occasion that S. Epiphanius compos'd the work which he calls *Ancoratus*, ρ which he wrote at the beginning of this year 374, as may be seen by his dates, all which agree with this time, except that he reckons the sixth year of Gratian for the seventh. σ He was already Bishop [of Constantia the metropolis of the isle of Cyprus, and had been so ever since the year 367.

It was likewise about the beginning of this year that the Church acquir'd a new defender [5] in the person of S. Amphilochius, who was made Bishop of Iconium the metropolis of Lycaonia.] τ God had probably remov'd some heretick out of this world who had tyranniz'd over this Church, to commit the care of it to so worthy a pastor. [But about the same time he permitted] υ that of Samosata to be depriv'd of S. Eusebius, one of the most couragious defenders that trûth had at that time. Valens banish'd him into Thrace, φ and had one Eunomius put in his place, a man of a very mild disposition; insomuch that finding no body would come to Church to him, he chose rather to retire. The Arians substituted Lucius in his place, one as like him of Alexandria in temper as he was in name, for he persecuted the Catholicks cruelly, and banish'd to several places Antiochus S. Eusebius's nephew, and the other principal Ecclesiasticks of that Church.

[5] See S. Amphilochius, §. 3.

[If the election of S. Amphilochius occasion'd joy in the East, the West receiv'd a yet greater piece of satisfaction in that of S. Ambrose, who being elected Bishop of Milan by a miracle, after the death of the unhappy Auxentius, was consecrated upon the seventh of December this year. The event shew'd that God had ordain'd him to prevent the revival of Arianism in the West, and to extinguish the last sparks which remain'd there.

A.D. 375. The Emperor Valentinian [6] spent the whole summer and autumn this year in Illyricum, and died there upon the 17th of November. This makes us place the Council of Illyricum [7] at this time, an account of which Theodorit has preserv'd to us and an epistle from that synod,] χ since

[6] See his title, §. 31.

[7] See Note 86.

π c. 1. p. 5. ρ c. 60. p. 64. a. σ c. 1. p. 2, 6. τ Bas. ep. 393. p. 402. b. υ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 12. p. 675. b. φ c. 13. p. 676, 677. χ p. 667. b, c, d.

he

he assures us that this Council was held by Valentinian's order, who confirm'd their decrees with the civil sanction. ↓ Theophanes says, that it was the Bishops who desir'd leave of Valentinian to meet. A.D. 375.

ω One of the occasions of the calling this Council appears to have been that a Bishop nam'd Eustathius, [who in all likelihood had been in Asia a little before,] had reported that the Church there was in a dismal condition, α that there were faults committed in the choice of Bishops and inferior ministers, and that they even separated the Holy Ghost [from the nature] of the Father and the Son, and that this was what was taught all over this part of the world: [That is, that the heresy of the Macedonians prevail'd there, to which all the history sufficiently agrees.]

β The Prelates of Illyricum being therefore assembled in a full body, γ acknowledg'd [and confirm'd] after a long examination the consubstantiality of the three divine persons, δ absolutely rejecting those who when they confess'd and sign'd the Consubstantiality, pretended they were only oblig'd to acknowledge a likeness of substance, and to believe the impious blasphemy, that the Son was a more excellent creature than the rest. ε They made likewise some decrees upon the Incarnation, [which seem to relate to the Apollinarians, who then began to appear in the world: But as their tenets were not well known at that time, the decisions of the Council did not directly concern what they contested. It was likewise probably in this assembly,] ζ that they depos'd six Arian Bishops, who would not confess that the Son and Holy Ghost are of the substance of the Father, namely Polychronius, Telemachus, Faustus, Asclepiades, Amantius, and Cleopater. [We see to what a state Arianism was reduc'd in the West; Ursacius, Valens, and the rest who made a noise in Constantius's reign, being now dead without doubt, unless we choose to say that there was no more mention made of them, because they had been condemn'd a good while ago, and that these six were some of their disciples, against whom there had been nothing as yet pronounc'd.]

η The Council thought it proper to give an account of these things to the Churches and the Bishops of [the Pro-

↓ Thphn. p. 52. b. ω Thdrt. l. 4. c. 8. p. 670. d. α c. β p. 669. c. | c. 7. p. 667. c. γ c. 8. p. 669. d. δ c. 7. p. 668, 669. ε p. 669. a, b. ζ c. 8. p. 671. a. | Conc. t. 2. p. 887. c. η Thdrt. l. 4. c. 7. p. 667. b. | c. 8. p. 669. c.

con-

A.D. 375. consular] Asia, [8] and of Phrygia, [these provinces being
[8] Note 92. perhaps more infected than the others of the same district:]
θ And they added concerning the ordinations of the Bi-
[9] Note 93. shops, Priests, and Deacons, that they must be taken [9] out
of the body of the Clergy, and not out of the officers of
the city or the army. ι They pronounce an anathema up-
on any person who does not believe the consubstantial Tri-
nity, or who communicates with those who do not believe
it. They mightily exhort the people of Asia to avoid this
blasphemy, κ or to embrace the truth if they have been in
error, λ that they may be at peace with them, and write
them letters of peace [and communion, which shews that
[10] ἐν κυρίῳ χαίρειν. this was not one,] μ tho' it wishes [10] them salvation in our
Lord: ν and they were even in doubt whether they should
write to them or no.

ξ The letter is almost nothing but a summary of the faith for Elpidius the Priest, whom the Council sent into Asia to carry it, and at the same time to inform himself of the faith which was taught there, and to preach the truth.

SECTION CXXVIII.

Valentinian writes likewise to the Churches of Asia; forbids the persecution of the Orthodox.

[1] Note 94. ο ELpidius was likewise sent from [1] the Emperor Valen-
tinian to carry the letter from the Council in his
name [and back'd with his authority, and without doubt
to carry likewise] π that which this prince wrote himself
to the Bishops of Asia and Phrygia, to confirm the decrees
of the Council, ρ and order that the faith of the consub-
stantial Trinity should be publish'd every where, that no-
body might pretend to reject it as not being the faith of
the prince who govern'd their country. He adds, that this
excuse which was unworthy of any Christian, was much
more so of Bishops, who ought to know how to distinguish

θ c. 8. p. 670. ι b. κ d. λ p. 671. a. μ b. | 669. d.
ν p. 670. a. ξ p. 669---671. ο Thdrt. l. 4. c. 8. p. 670. b.
π c. 7. p. 667. c. ρ d.

between

between what is due to God and what to Cæsar, σ and who therefore cannot make the will of the prince the excuse for the corruption of their doctrine. Above all he forbids them and every body else to persecute and turn out those who serve God better and with purer faith than they do, by obeying at once both his and God's laws. A. D. 375.

τ He sends them the acts of the Council, and even inserts a decree, υ which Theodorit seems to think is an abridgment of the letter from the Council to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia. φ But what we read in the decree upon the Incarnation, is not to be met with in the letter from the Council. [So that it is probable this decree is a different thing from the letter, and set down in its own terms,] χ tho' by way of abridgment. ψ The word hypostasis is us'd in it for that of person: [Which is extraordinary for the Westerns. But if this decree was made to be sent to the Easterns, the rule of charity dictates that they should conform themselves to their way of speaking: And if this so christian moderation had been always follow'd, as it was order'd by S. Athanasius in the Council of Alexandria, the Church would not have been disturb'd about the different use of a word, the sense of which was not perfectly agreed upon.

We must likewise observe, that the Council of Illyricum declares in this act, that they form their belief upon that of the Councils held at Rome and in France, of which we have no other knowledge, any more than] ω of some persons, before whom Valentinian said that he had given the orders mention'd in his rescript. α Baronius says, that some thought they were Priests of Rome deputed [by the Pope] to wait upon the Emperor. β Others choose rather to believe they were some Bishops of Illyricum, sent by the Council to make a report of what had pass'd in their assembly, as was a common practice. γ The Emperor's letter runs in the name of Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian, δ according to the custom of the Roman princes, who made the orders they publish'd run in the name of their collegues: ε But it is easy to judge that this came purely from Valentinian, to whom Theodorit ascribes it, since it was made

σ p. 668. a, b, c. τ p. 668, 669. υ p. 669. c. φ a, b, c. χ p. 668. d. ψ a. | 669. a. ω p. 668. c. α Bar. 365. §. 23. β Thdrt. n. p. 33. 1. b. γ l. 4. c. 7. p. 667. b. δ Blond. prim. p. 129. ε Thdrt. p. 667. b.

to

A. D. 375. to support the decree of the Council of Illyricum, which was held under Valentinian, and Valens would never of himself speak of the Consubstantiality in the terms of this rescript. But as on the other hand] ζ he * exercis'd authority in things which related to Valens's government, [it seems necessary to acknowledge that Valens had an hand in it,] η that is that his brother, who, as we see by Ammianus, had a good deal of power over him, made him publish it: From whence however we cannot conclude, θ as Theodorit has done, that Valens was not as yet fallen into Arianism; [as nothing can be concluded in Constantius's favour, from Constans his younger brother's making him restore S. Athanasius.]

ι The Greek of this letter, which Theodorit calls likewise a law, [and of the epistle from the Council, are nothing without doubt but translations from the original Latin, extrmeley ill done, as is pretty usual, and very much corrupted; so that they are very obscure. But for all that they are clear enough] κ to make us esteem Valentinian's piety, [and to shew us that the modesty of this prince,] λ who thought himself unworthy to meddle in the affairs of the Church, [was not however void of zeal, when his duty oblig'd him to concern himself with them, and to serve God as an Emperor, by doing for the Church what none but Emperors could do.

It is not said what it was that mov'd Valentinian to do this important piece of service to the Church. But there is some reason to presume, that the holy order of S. Ambrose contributed very much towards it, together with the solicitations of Dorotheus a Priest of the East, whom S. Basil and some other Bishops had sent the year before to desire the assistance of the Westerns and the protection of Valentinian. We know still less what effect the rescript of this prince and the letter from the Council had in the East. We do not find that the Eastern Church receiv'd any relief from it, and the persecution instead of being at an end increas'd the more: Which proceeded without doubt from the death of Valentinian, who was carried off

ζ p. 668. b. η n. p. 32. 1. a, b. θ l. 4. c. 7. p. 667. c. ι b. Thphn. p. 52. b. κ b. λ Soz. l. 6. c. 21. p. 665. c.

* τὸ ἡμέτερον κράτος διὰ παντὸς ἐνετέλλετο, &c.

all

all at once by a violent bleeding upon the 17th of November this very year; after which Valens had nothing to hinder him from following his natural inclinations.] A. D. 375.

SECTION CXXIX.

Of the Council of Laodicea: Isauria is united to the Church.

μ MR. de Marca infers from the superscription of the two letters we have just been speaking of, that there was a Council held in Asia at that time, to which these two letters were directed, and he thinks that it was the Council of Laodicea. [But it is pretty difficult to infer this from these superscriptions, which run to some Bishops without any hint of their being assembled together, especially from the Council's letter, which was sent as much to the Churches as the Bishops of Asia; and it would be hard to be oblig'd to say, that a Synod whose Canons have always been receiv'd in the Church, was a Mock-Council of the Macedonians, enemies to the faith and separated from the Catholick Church,

As to the different opinions of the time of this Council's being held, we meet with no difficulty in following that of] Mr. de Marca, who supposes it to be held between that of Antioch in the year 341 and that of Constantinople in 381, according to the order in which it is plac'd in the Code of Canons after the time of Dionysius Exiguus and the VI General Council, [or rather before the Council of Chalcedon, for we should not depart from this order without pressing reasons, in the number of which it would be difficult to reckon] ν those which Baronius alledges to shew it should be plac'd before the Council of Nice. ξ All the polity and order settled by this Council, sufficiently shews that it was held at a time of perfect peace, and when the Church was in a condition of providing for the outward

μ Marc. conc. l. 3. c. 3. §. 1. p. 133. ν Bar. app. t. 4. p. 735.
ξ Du Pin, t. 2. p. 876.

A.D. 375. decoration of her ſervice; and not before the Council of Nice, nor even before the middle of the fourth century.

[Baronius ſeems to have been in the right in ſaying that the name of the Photinians, which is ſometimes us'd as an argument to prove it, is an interpolation in the ſeventh Canon, among the hereticks whoſe baptiſm the Church allow'd to be valid, not becauſe of the impiety of theſe hereticks, nor becauſe of the conformity of their doctrine to that of the Paulianiſts, which ſignifies nothing to the validity of baptiſm;] ο but becauſe the ſixteenth Canon of the ſecond Council of Arles teſtifies, either that the Paulianiſts and Photinians were at that time united in ſect and practice as well as principle, or at leaſt that the Church treated them in the ſame manner, and rejected the baptiſm both of the one and the other, as not baptizing in the name of the Trinity.

π We have ſixty Canons of the Council of Laodicea, the 35th of which is cited by Theodorit; ρ and the 60th gives a catalogue of the Canonical books, which takes in all thoſe of the New Teſtament, excepting the Revelation. Of the Old it omits Judith, Tobit, Wiſdom, Eccleſiaſticus, and the Maccabees. σ This Council met at Laodicea in Phrygia Pacatiana, and was made up of the ſeveral provinces of Aſia, as the title bears: [but we know no more of it.] τ Some
[1] Note 95. ſay that it was [1] held under one Theodoſius or Theodotus Biſhop of Laodicea. [We do not know who he is;] but we know very well that he is not Theodotus of Laodicea in Syria, who was dead in the year 335.

[2] See S. Baſil, §. 107. [[2] It was probably at the beginning of this year, that the Churches of Iſauria join'd the communion of S. Baſil and the Catholick Church, by the means of Sympius or Sympoſius of Seleucia their chief. They had probably been of the Macedonian party. We muſt ſay the ſame thing] υ of ſome Biſhops and Prieſts of Lycia, who thought at the ſame time of ſeparating from the other Biſhops of Aſia to join S. Baſil. [But if they are thoſe] φ to whom S. [3] Amphilochius
[3] See his title, §. 5. wrote the following year to prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, they were not reunited at that time, tho' they had ſuffer'd great perſecutions, [without doubt from the Arians,] whoſe communion they rejected.

ο Conc. t. 1. p. 298. a. b. π Thdrt. in Col. 2. p. 355. c.
ρ Conc. t. 1. p. 1507. σ p. 1496. b. τ Phiſg. n. p. 325.
υ Baſ. ep. 403. p. 420. a, b. φ Cotel. g. t. 2. p. 99--104.

SEC-

SECTION CXXX.

Demosthenes persecutes Cappadocia and the neighbouring provinces.

χ THE fire which consum'd all the East, and which [for four years] surrounded Cappadocia without being felt almost, approach'd nearer about the end of this year, [and threw into that country pretty fierce flames.] ↓ Demosthenes who was at that time Lieutenant of this province and of all Pontus, [1] was a friend to the hereticks, but more an enemy to the Catholicks. It was not that he knew any thing of the disputes of religion, nor that he was even capable of understanding them; but his passion supply'd the place of knowledge. For which reason tho' he was never so much taken up with the care of his body, ω yet he allow'd himself time to judge the affairs of the Church, and to receive the accusations which the enemies to peace brought before his tribunal upon that subject. The Catholick Bishops ought at least to have been call'd in to inform him of the truth, but he did not mind any of these formalities.

[1] See S. Basil, §. 73, 115--118.

α He caus'd a Mock-Council of wicked people and Arians to meet in the middle of winter in Galatia, β at Ancyra, where Eustathius of Sebastia was present, and communicated with them in private houses, because they did not † as yet receive him publickly to their communion. γ It was there that the Lieutenant turn'd out Hypsius, and put into his place one Ecdicius, δ surnam'd of Parnassus: [2] so that it seems Hypsius was Bishop of the same city which is in Cappadocia. And then it must be upon the death of his predecessor that S. Basil wrote his 185th epistle,] ε which he addresses to the Church of Parnassus, by way of consolation for the loss of their Bishop,

[2] Note 96.

χ Bas. ep. 297. p. 288. c. ↓ ep. 264, 385. p. 262, 378.
ω p. 378. d. α ep. 264. p. 263. a. β ep. 73. p. 121. a.
γ ep. 264. p. 263. a. δ ep. 10. p. 53. ε ep. 185. p. 198.

† ἕτως. it should be probably ἔπω.

A.D. 375. who died a little while before, full of years and merits. He exhorts them to repair this loſs immediately by chooſing a new paſtor fit to govern them: [and this new Biſhop muſt be Hypſius whom we are ſpeaking of.]

ζ S. Baſil ſays, that he who had fix'd Ecdicius in the government of the Churches, was very ill prepar'd for the next world. [He ſeems to intimate that this was Euſtathius.] η Ecdicius indeed immediately join'd in communion with Baſilides of Gangra θ in Paphlagonia, who was an open Arian.

ι Demoſthenes after having turn'd out Hypſius, attack'd S. Gregory Nyſſen, κ and gave orders that he ſhould be brought before him as a priſoner, under the pretence of ſome money which they ſaid he ow'd; but he hid himſelf and eſcap'd, as may be ſeen in his hiſtory. λ S. Baſil ſent the news of it to S. Amphilochius in a letter which he wrote at Chriſtmaſs or ſoon after.

A.D. 376. μ Demoſthenes was afterwards taken up ſome time with other affairs, and then went to Cæſarea, where to ſatisfy his rage againſt the Catholicks, with one word he made all the Clergy of that Church ſubject to ſecular offices. He went from thence to Sebaſtia, where he treated in the ſame manner all whom he found there attach'd to S. Baſil's communion, paying on the contrary a great deal of honour to thoſe who continued in that of Euſtathius.

ν He ſtay'd ſome days at Sebaſtia, [where] he order'd that thoſe of Galatia and Pontus [who were Arians, ſhould aſſemble together at Nyſſa to hold a new Council there. They did not fail to be obedient and to run thither: [but all that we know they did,] is that they ſent to the Churches [perhaps to deſtroy them under the pretence of viſiting them,] a man worthy to be the miniſter and executioner of their wills. [They confirm'd there without doubt the baniſhment of S. Gregory, but did not as yet put any body in his place, ſince S. Baſil mentions it only in an epiſtle of a later date, and not in] that which he wrote when they went from Nyſſa to Sebaſtia to join Euſtathius.

[We ſhall obſerve [3] in another place with what reſpect Euſtathius had them receiv'd every where, that he might

[3] See S. Baſil, §. 81, 82, 90, 94.

ζ ep. 10. p. 53. c. η ep. 73. p. 121. a. θ ep. 72. p. 118. a. ι ep. 264. p. 263. a. κ a. | ep. 385. p. 378. d. λ ep. 404. p. 420. μ ep. 264. p. 263. a, b. ν a, b.

prevail

prevail with the Arians to take off the sentence of deposition which they had pronounc'd against him in 360. But as this was not yet done, and perhaps never was, he could not obtain of these Bishops whom he treated with so much regard, to receive him publickly to their communion in his own Church, of which he had made them the masters, because they were afraid, if they had done it, of being disown'd by the heads of their sect. A. D. 376.

The misfortunes which Demosthenes brought upon the Church, were not confin'd within the bounds we have mention'd.] ξ He proceeded so far as to shed blood: and one Asclepius refusing to communicate with Eustathius or some other Arian Bishop whom S. Basil mentions under the name of Doeg, was so dreadfully beaten by the Lieutenant's order, that he died, or rather went to true life: [So that he deserves to be plac'd in the number of Martyrs, tho' we do not find that he has been known hitherto either to the Greeks or Latins.] The persecution against the Priests and Doctors was of a piece with this cruelty; and every thing was done that could be by furious people, supported as they pleas'd by the secular powers.

ο The Church of Nicopolis [the metropolis of the lesser Armenia,] had lost about this time Theodotus their Bishop, [who was very zealous for the true faith.] The Lieutenant did all that he could to make them receive a successor from the hands of Eustathius. The Bishops of the Mock-Council of Nyssa went thither on purpose to favour his intentions, and to labour with him in destroying that Church. [+ They could not however succeed in their designs, and they chose for their Bishop Fronto a Priest, who had acquir'd a great deal of reputation among the Catholicks. But this wretch soon baulk'd their expectations, and in all likelihood receiv'd ordination from the hands of Eustathius. This made all the people rise, who chose rather to suffer the most cruel persecutions, than acknowledge him for Bishop:] So that the Catholick Prelates of the province, with one consent and by the advice of S. Basil, translated to Nicopolis Euphronius who was already Bishop of Colonia in the same province, making the laws of the Church yield to the benefit of souls, for whose sake alone those are made.

+ ibid. §. 118.

ξ ep. 405. p. 421. c, d. ο p. 421. d.

A.D. 376. [Whilſt this paſs'd, the hereticks continued their violences againſt the Church:] π and it was then that they plac'd a wretched intruder at Nyſſa in the room of S. Gregory whom they had turn'd out: which S. Baſil imputes particularly to Anyſius Evippus's diſciple and to Ecdicius of Parnaſſus, or to their emiſſaries.

ρ The fleſhy beaſt (that is Demoſthenes) troubled likewiſe the Church of Doara, σ which was only a market-town [in Cappadocia ſecunda.] They ſent thither a man of looſe morals, who had left ſome orphans that were under his care, and had run away; and they did ſuch an injury to the epiſcopate as to proſtitute it to this infamous wretch, to gratify a woman of no religion, who having abus'd George juſt as ſhe pleas'd, had had this man for his ſucceſſor. [This George [5] had probably been an Arian Biſhop of thoſe quarters.]

[5] See §. 92.

τ S. Baſil ſpeaking of this, ſays that they had given Doara her old mule-driver, and ſays no more; [this was perhaps his firſt trade. So that he muſt formerly have pretended to be the Biſhop of this town.] υ And indeed [6] S. Gregory Nazianzen obſerves, that about the year 373 they had turn'd out an heretick, to put Eulalius in his place, at whoſe ordination he was preſent, and made a diſcourſe in S. Baſil's abſence. [This might give an handle to the hereticks to turn out Eulalius, and reſtore his competitor.]

[6] See his title, §. 37.

φ The Arians had many other deſigns in their heads beſides this, and they pretended to nothing leſs than depoſing S. Baſil himſelf in a Council which they already talk'd of being held. [But God confounded all their deſigns. It appears however that at this time there was a Council of the Macedonians held at Cyzicus.] χ For Euſtathius being come to this city, ſign'd there a new profeſſion of faith, in which inſtead of the Conſubſtantiality, he brought in again his old Likeneſs of ſubſtance, and with Eunomius utter'd blaſphemies againſt the Holy Ghoſt. We do not know what this confeſſion contain'd beſides, [or any thing that might paſs in this aſſembly.]

π ep. 10. p. 53. c. ρ ep. 395. p. 406. d. σ ep. 10. p. 53. c, d. τ ep. 395. p. 406. d. υ Naz. or. 30. p. 495. φ Baſ. ep. 264. p. 263. d. χ ep. 82. p. 153. a. | 155. a.

SECT

SECTION CXXXI.

Valens persecutes the Monks: Euzoïus of Antioch dies.

[THE Church suffer'd no less in the other provinces of the East, than in those of the district of Pontus,] ♆ after Valentinian was dead, and Valens who had no longer any body to put him to shame, gave full liberty to his passion. ω As the hermits were the men who chiefly maintain'd the Catholick faith, [both by their prayers] and the authority which their vertue and miracles gave them among the people; α so it is observ'd that Valens oppress'd and persecuted them in a particular manner. He made a law to oblige them to bear arms, and list themselves in his troops: [They were far enough from doing this; and indeed they were laid under these commands only to make them criminals.

[1] This was without doubt the occasion of the persecution which was rais'd about this time against the monks of Antioch, as S. Chrysostom gives us an account.] β They went and search'd for them even in their caves, from whence they dragg'd them by force, to bring them to the city, and deliver them up to the judges: They beat them, they gave them all manner of ill treatment in the middle of the city, and in publick view, and afterwards] they put them in prison. Every body gloried in telling what they had done against them. γ This was the usual subject of their conversation and their jests; and nothing else was to be heard in the publick places, either in the shops or other places where those people resorted, who neither did nor desir'd to do any good. δ And all this was done by Christians, [but Arians,] and people who pretended to religion and the fear of God, ε whilst the heathens pleas'd to see the Christians fall foul thus one upon another, laugh'd equally both at those that suffer'd in this persecution, and at those who caus'd it.

[1] See S. Chrysost.

♆ Oros. l. 7. c. 33. p. 219. 1. c. ω Soz. l. 6. c. 20. p. 662. b, c. α Hier. chr. | Oros. p. 219. 1. c. β Chry. vit. mon. l. 1. c. 2. t. 4. p. 359. c. γ b. δ p. 357. c. ε p. 359. d.

A. D. 376. ζ They even forbad with great threats that any body ſhould be deſir'd to lead a monaſtick life; [inſomuch that this ſeems to have been one article of Valens's law.] η For theſe pretended diſciples of [the crucified] Jeſus θ could not bear that people of birth and fortune, who had it in their power to lead a life of pleaſure and voluptuouſneſs, ſhould embrace a hard [and ſevere] courſe of life. ι There was even one over whom the devil had ſo much power as to make him utter this blaſphemy, that he would chooſe rather to renounce the faith, and ſacrifice to devils.

[In the country about Antioch] κ as ſoon as Lent was over, they went and fir'd the [2] cells or rather the hutts of ſome hermits of Syria, and laid all their labours in aſhes. [We may imagine that the reſt were not much better us'd. But the Arians ſpent their cruelty in a particular manner upon the ſolitaries of Egypt:] λ and they maſſacred there great multitudes of Saints, as S. Jerom ſays expreſly of the mountain of Nitria. [The reſt were baniſh'd to Diocæſarea in Paleſtine, and as far as Pontus and Armenia, or elſe diſpers'd in divers places.] The two great Macarii, and ſome others of the moſt illuſtrious of them, were ſent to an iſland where there were no Chriſtians, but where they made great numbers by their miracles: inſomuch that they were oblig'd to ſend them back to their cells, becauſe the people would not ſuffer thoſe to be ill us'd whom God had ſo publickly glorified. [We reſerve the account of this perſecution for the hiſtory of S. Macarius of Egypt.]

[2] See S. Baſil, §. 121.

μ Oroſius ſays he cannot expreſs better than by ſilence what was done in all the other provinces againſt the Catholick Churches and people, in the execution of the ſame orders as had caus'd ſuch dreadful misfortunes in Egypt.

[In the midſt of this unhappy triumph of Arianiſm, God call'd to his terrible tribunal him who was the head of that ſect, as well upon the account of ſo many crimes as he had committed for near ſixty years together ſince he had join'd Arius, as of his age and the intereſt he had. I mean Euzoius, who had held the ſee of Antioch for the Arians ever ſince the year 361.] ν For tho' S. Jerom writes, that he was Biſhop of Antioch in Theodoſius's reign; [yet Socra-

ζ p. 357. a. η c. θ p. 358 a. ι p. 357. c. κ Baſ. ep. 200. p. 218. a. λ Hier. chr. | Oroſ. p. 219. 1. c. μ Oroſ. p. 219. 1. c, d. ν Hier. in Lucif. c. 7. p. 144. c.

tes,

tes, who is esteem'd more exact than S. Jerom in point of date,] ξ says expressly that he died in the fifth Consulate of Valens and the first of Valentinian the younger, [that is, in this year 376.] ο They put Dorotheus in his place, π sometimes call'd [3] Theodorus, ρ who was before Bishop of the same party at Heraclea in Thrace. [We have seen in [4] another place what sort of a man he was.] A.D. 376.

[3] See Note 90.

[4] See §. 114.

SECTION CXXXII.

Of Ulphilas Bishop of the Goths.

[WE are now come to the last year but one of the life and reign of Valens, which may be said to have been likewise the last but one of the reign of Arianism among the Romans and in the East. But by a terrible effect of the unsearchable judgments of God, [1] at the same time that this heresy was going to be extinguish'd among the Romans, it infected many barbarous nations, and corrupted them to such a degree, that by this means it became mistress of almost all the West, and rode triumphant there till the end of the VI Century. What makes this event the more astonishing, is that Bishop † Ulphilas, who was in this affair the instrument of God's great anger, seem'd as if he could only have been the instrument of his mercy, tho' not so much by his ministry, as by the extraordinary gifts which God had bestow'd upon him, and by the wonders which he had wrought by him.] A.D. 377.

[1] Note 97.

σ This man was descended from some Christians of the village of Sadagolthinum near the city of Parnassus in Cappadocia, who were taken captive in the ravages which the Goths had made in that country [about the year 260] in the reigns of Valerian and Gallian, and of the number of

ξ Socr. l. 4. c. 35. p. 253. a. ο b. π Soz. l. 6. c. 37. p. 699. b. ρ Philg. l. 9. c. 14. p. 128, 129. σ Philg. l. 2. c. 5. p. 11.

† otherwise, *Ulfilas*, *Julfilas*, or *Vulphilas*; and in Philostorgius *Urphilas*.

those

A.D. 377. those who contributed to the conversion of that nation. [He was not] the first Bishop of the Goths, as Philostorgius pretends, [who in all likelihood would not have said so,] τ if he had not been desirous of setting off the character of this Prelate, [because he was so unhappy as to corrupt the faith of all the Northern nations, and to introduce Arianism there.] υ For he was [at least] successor to Theophilus, who had assisted at the Council of Nice. φ Philostorgius says likewise, that being sent upon a deputation to Constantine by his prince, he was ordain'd Bishop of his nation by Eusebius of Nicomedia, χ and spent some time after in Mysia with a great number of Christians, whom the Pagan Goths had driven out of their country. [All that we can say to this, is that we see no reason to doubt that Ulphilas return'd into Gothia, if he was driven from thence,] ψ and that he follow'd for some time, as Socrates and Sozomen say he did, the Catholick faith of the Council of Nice, after the example of his predecessor; ω and it was that which the Goths had receiv'd for a long time from the tradition of their fathers.

α He propagated religion very much in his own country, and introduc'd there something of order, civilizing the people, and bringing them off from their barbarity. He likewise signaliz'd himself for exposing his person to a great many dangers for the conversion of these people. β Besides, he invented letters for them, γ and the characters are to be seen at this day in some places, δ he translated all the bible into their language, that they might learn it, ε excepting the books of the Kings, being afraid that the reading of so many wars and battles as are mention'd there, would raise a greater desire in these people for a thing for which they had already but too much inclination and ardor. [We must not wonder if after this the Goths] ζ had a very extraordinary respect for him, so as to receive all his words as so many inviolable laws; η being persuaded that he could neither say nor do any thing, that was not good in itself, and serviceable to others.

τ p. 13. υ Socr. l. 2. c. 41. p. 155. a. φ Phisg. p. 12. χ p. 10--- 12. ψ Socr. p. 155. a. | Soz. l. 6. c. 37. p. 697. c, d. ω Thdrt. l. 4. c. 33. p. 704. d. α Soz. l. 6. c. 37. p. 698. a. β b. | Socr. l. 4. c. 35. p. 251. c. γ Grotius. | Boll. 12. apr. p. 87. b. δ Soz. p. 698. b. | Socr. p. 251. c. ε Phisg. l. 2. c. 5. p. 12. ζ Thdrt. p. 704. d. η Soz. p. 698. a.

[So

[So shining a merit, and this extreme veneration which was paid him, were great temptations, and a man must be possess'd of very profound humility to bear so extraordinary an exaltation. But if error is generally the punishment of pride, it is easy to imagine that Ulphilas's mind was puff'd up with vanity before he fell into heresy. This is an eminent and remarkable but terrible example of what S. Gregory says,] θ that there are some persons in the Church, who seem to do great things and what is inimitable by the generality of mankind, whom yet God rejects as men who are perfectly carnal, because the ground of their actions is not the grace of the Holy Spirit, but a great desire after the opinion and praise of men; because their courage is not the strength of charity, but the stiffness of pride. A.D. 377.

[This is what God saw a long time before in Ulphilas's heart, and what was at last visible to all the world, when he unhappily abus'd the power which the Goths had given him over their minds, by engaging them in Arianism, by corrupting all the Christians in the North, and reviving in the West an impiety which so many Saints seem'd to have extinguish'd as well by their sufferings as their writings.]

ι He was present [in the year 360] at the Council, which Acacius, Eudoxius, [and the other Arians] held at Constantinople: And tho' till that time he had always follow'd the principles of the Catholick Church, κ without signing any of the Arian confessions, yet then he sign'd that of Ariminum or Constantinople, [which was condemn'd by all the world as impious.] λ This crime into which he fell more through inadvertency than any other cause, [might have been serviceable to him, if he had humbled himself for it, and had taken care to have made amends for it as he ought. But the consequence gives ground to believe, that by neglecting this first fall, he deserv'd like Saul to be given up to others much more dreadful.

This did not appear at first,] μ and he continued some time afterwards to communicate with the Catholick Prelates, the defenders of the Nicene faith. ν S. Basil writing in 372 at the latest, says that the faith was preach'd in its perfect purity beyond the Danube, [that is among the

θ Greg. in Reg. c. 9, 14. p. 175. c. | 295. ι Soz. p. 697. d.
κ Socr. p. 155. λ Soz. p. 697. d μ d. | n. p. 148. 1. c.
ν Bas. ep. 338. p. 330. c, d.

Goths,

A.D. 377. Goths, of whom it is certain he is speaking in that place.] ξ S. Austin who speaks only of what some Christians who were at this very time in Gothia, had told him, assures us that there were not then any other Christians among the Goths but Catholicks. ο S. Epiphanius who wrote in 376 or 377, speaking of those who had been banish'd four years before by the persecution of the Heathens, says that they were some Audæan schismaticks and *we* Christians; [by which it is plain he means the Catholicks.] π The Gothick martyrs of whom S. Ambrose speaks, are without doubt those who suffer'd in his time: And he certainly thought them Catholicks, since he says that the victories of the Goths over the Romans proceeded perhaps from these Saints confessing by the oblation of their blood him whose divine aud eternal generation the Arians contested.

ρ S. Jerom and Orosius say, that they who suffer'd death or banishment at that time, were Christians: which they could not say in general without any distinction, if either all or part of them had been Arians; especially Orosius, who gives them in expres terms the glory and crown of martyrdom. [² Ascolius of Thessalonica and S. Basil have honour'd them as such, and all the Church does it at this day, particularly with regard to S. Nicetas and S. Sabas.] σ For as to the Audæans whom S. Epiphanius joins with the Catholicks, they were but a small number in all likelihood, since no author speaks of them; τ and besides, it was easy to distinguish them, since they would never pray with any but those of their own sect, and had even quitted the name of Christians to take that of the author of their schism.

² See S. Sabas Martyr.

SECTION CXXXIII.

The Goths suffer themselves to be drawn into Arianism by Ulphilas.

υ ARianism at length got footing in Gothia, according to Socrates and Sozomen, by means of a civil war

ξ Aug. civ. l. 18. c. 52. p. 239. 2. d. ο Epi. 70. c. 15. p. 828. a, b. π Amb. in Luc. c. 2. p. 26. b. ρ Hier. chr. | Oros. l. 7. c. 32. p. 218. 2. e. σ Epi. p. 828. a, b. τ p. 827. c. υ Socr. l. 4. c. 33. p. 251. a, b, c. | Soz. l. 6. c. 37. p. 697. b, c.

which

which broke out between two Gothick Princes, Athanaric and Fritigern, [of whom ſome hiſtorians make the firſt the Head of the Oſtrogoths, and the other of the Viſigoths.] Fritigern being overcome by Athanaric, begg'd aſſiſtance of the Romans, by which means he became and continued victorious, and ſo as it were out of gratitude he embrac'd the Arian doctrine which Valens its protector held, together with Ulphilas his Biſhop, and his ſubjects; and by this means Arianiſm communicated itſelf likewiſe to [the Oſtrogoths] Athanaric's ſubjects. A.D. 377.

[We ſee nothing that hinders us abſolutely from believing this ſtory, if we place it about the year 375, but we cannot ſay that it is very certain.] φ Sozomen himſelf acknowledges, that this was not the only cauſe of the misfortune which the Goths had of loſing the Catholick faith, but that this terrible accident muſt be referr'd to the time when they were driven out of their country by the Huns, [and [t] oblig'd to have recourſe to Valens in the year 376, to have leave to retire within the dominions of the Empire.] χ Ulphilas was the chief of the deputies whom they ſent to him for this end, ψ and the Arian Biſhops, [who were willing to make uſe of every opportunity to deſtroy themſelves and other people,] obtain'd of Valens that he would bring them to communicate with him, in order to make the peace the firmer by the bond of one faith [and one communion.] The Goths who had receiv'd the faith a long time before, and had been inſtructed in the apoſtolick doctrine, rejected this propoſal. But Ulphilas [who was wont to regard men more than God,] ω ſuffer'd himſelf to be impos'd upon by the falſe arguments of the Arians, or [rather] by the promiſe which they made him of getting his buſineſs that he came for done with the Emperor, provided he would come into their principles. α It is even ſaid that he receiv'd money of them, [to ſell his ſoul and all his nation to them.] β Thus under the pretence of a [falſe] neceſſity, [without remembring that a Chriſtian lies under no neceſſity but that of not ſinning, and ſaving his ſoul at the hazard of every thing elſe,] γ he oblig'd himſelf to perſuade the Goths by the authority he had over them, that all theſe diſputes did not relate to the

[t] See Valens, §. 17.

φ Soz. p. 697. b, d. χ b. ψ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 33. p. 704, 705. ω Soz. p. 697. d. α Thdrt. p. 704. d. β Soz. p. 697. d. γ Thdrt. p. 705. a

faith,

A.D. 377. faith, and that they were only party-quarrels for interest and preferment; and by this means he got them to communicate with the Arians, δ thus separating himself and them from the Catholick Church. ε They desir'd some Bishops of Valens, to join [with Ulphilas] in instructing [both the Catholicks and the Pagans of] their nation [in the doctrine which they had just embrac'd;] and Valens did not fail to send them some of those who were the best skill'd in Arianism, who succeeded but too well to their misfortune.

[The alliance of Ulphilas with Valens and his Bishops was soon at an end, the ill conduct and avarice of the Roman officers having oblig'd the Goths to take up arms in 377, and act as open enemies. But his alliance with the devil of pride, and the anger of God which was upon him, did not suffer him to confess before men that he had sinn'd, and that he was oblig'd to make satisfaction for the crime he had committed.] ζ So that the Goths being once fallen into Arianism, they persisted in it, η and even communicated it as it were out of friendship not only to the other people of their nation, but likewise to the Gepidii. θ It is thought, that it pass'd from them to the Vandals, all these nations being, as is pretended, only the Goths themselves to whom they have given several names. [It was likewise without doubt by the correspondence with the Goths, that the Burgundians became Arians,] ι whereas they were Catholicks before.

[We see how one single man drew into hell this infinite number of Northern people, who embrac'd Arianism with him and after him. These people who as they apply'd themselves to nothing but war,] κ had almost no knowledge of letters and books, and so knew little more of religion than what their teachers told them, lay under a sort of necessity to follow them equally in good or evil: which may lessen their crime, but it augments that of the others who drew them into heresy, [and of whom they may say one day more truly than those of whom S. Cyprian speaks: "Our fathers have been our murderers. It is a terrible "example of what truth itself says: That if the blind lead "the blind, they shall both fall into the ditch:" And

δ Soz. p. 698. a. ε Oros. l. 7. c. 33. p. 219. 2. d. ζ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 33. p. 705. a. η Jorn. r. Got. c. 25. p. 646. θ Grot. r. Got. p. 646. ι Oros. p. 219. 1. b. κ Salv. l. 5. p. 102, 103.

S. Au-

S. Auſtin had a good deal of reaſon to tell the paſtors and people ſo often, that they muſt ſtick to Jeſus Chriſt alone and to the truth of his Goſpel, and not to any man whoever he be; whatever gift either of nature or grace he may be poſſeſs'd of, becauſe all men are liars, ſubject to be deceiv'd, and even to fall entirely as Ulphilas did. But as religion and ſalvation is eaſier to be known and attain'd by great minds and learned men, than by the ignorant and people of mean capacities, who cannot be ſav'd but by the aſſiſtance and inſtruction of others; what remains for them to do, but to beg of God, by the purity of their life and the ardor of their prayers, to give them true and faithful paſtors to lead them to heaven, and not wolves to throw them into hell? A.D. 377.

We meet with nothing more relating to Ulphilas after this time.] λ As for Valens, he was ſoon puniſh'd for the crime he had been guilty of in making others commit the ſame, and that by thoſe very people whom he boaſted of having drawn into it. The Goths being oblig'd [in the year 377] to take up arms, defeated his Generals, cut his armies in pieces, ravag'd his provinces; and [the next year] after a terrible ſlaughter of the Roman army, burnt him alive, [ſo that his puniſhment had ſome reſemblance, even in the eyes of men, with the eternal flames into which his crime had drawn ſo many miſerable creatures.]

μ It ſeems that all the Gothick nation did not at firſt embrace Arianiſm, ſince S. Nicetas who was a true Catholick, was Biſhop of the Goths and many other barbarians, at the end of this century and the beginning of the next. ν S. Chryſoſtom wrote to ſome Gothick monks in the monaſtery of Promotus ξ near Conſtantinople, ο by whom he was inform'd of the death of the admirable Unilas whom he had made Biſhop of Gothia, and who had done wonderful things. The King of the Goths wrote to have another Biſhop ſent; π and S. Chryſoſtom endeavour'd even in his baniſhment to get them one ordain'd. [It is plain, that all theſe Goths were Catholicks, and not Arians.] ρ In an homily which bears the name of S. Chryſoſtom, and which he might preach in 398, we read that the Goths who us'd for-

λ Oroſ. p. 219. 2. d. μ Bar. 370. §. 118. ν Chry. ep. 207. p. 811. d. ξ Cang. de C. l. 4. p. 186. f. ο Chry. ep. 14. p. 685. b, c. π c, d. | ep. 206, 207. p. 811, 812. ρ t. 6. h. 20. p. 198. b.

merly

A.D. 377. merly to murder their fathers, then esteem'd it matter of joy to shed their blood for the true religion. σ There were likewise still many heathens among them, as Radagasius who had an army of above an hundred thousand men, [or even four hundred thousand.]

τ Theodorit says, that those who were perverted by Ulphilas, did not however embrace all the impieties of the Arians, and that they would never say that the Son was a creature, but that they would readily communicate with them who did say so, and said themselves that he was inferior to the Father; from whence it was pretty easy to make them conclude that he was a creature.] υ The Vandals added likewise to the practices of the old Arians that of rebaptizing: [and God permitted it perhaps that they might corrupt the fewer people;] φ every body naturally abhorring rebaptization, [and renouncing his first baptism to receive a second.]

SECTION CXXXIV.

Valens is oblig'd by the war with the Goths to put an end to the persecution, and dies miserably: The Catholicks being recall'd by Gratian, return to their Churches.

A.D. 378. χ THE disturbance which the war with the Goths caus'd in the Empire, and the advantages which they had gain'd over the Romans in the year 377, taking up Valens entirely, oblig'd him to cease from persecuting the Church, and to leave off banishing the Bishops. S. Jerom and Rufinus even assure us, that he repented at last, tho' too late, [of the injuries he had done to God's true creatures,] ↓ and recall'd *our* people from banishment, ω that is, that he re-

σ Aug. civ. l. 5. c. 23. p. 63. 2 a, b. p. 705. a. υ Vand. p. 9, 96, 101, 103. τ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 33. φ Aug. de bapt. c. 5, 6. B. p. 145. b, d. χ Socr. l. 4. c. 35. p. 252. d. | Soz. l. 6. c. 37. p. 696. c. | 699. a. ↓ Hier. chr. ω Ruf. l. 2. c. 13. p. 258.

leas'd

leas'd the [Catholick] Biſhops and Prieſts who were ba- A.D. 378.
niſh'd, the monks who were condemn'd to the mines, α and
all the other Confeſſors: [' of which however there is ' Note 98.
reaſon enough to doubt. If he actually did any thing for
the Church,] β it was, according to the hiſtorians, when
he left Antioch [in April or May this year, to go to Con-
ſtantinople, and oppoſe the Goths in perſon. It is not how-
ever obſerv'd that any of the Confeſſors came back before
Valens's death, except Peter of Alexandria, of whoſe re-
turn hiſtory gives us this account.]

γ The war with the Goths obliging Valens to leave An-
tioch, and to let this Church be quiet as well as all the
reſt, the Catholicks who had been ſo cruelly perſecuted,
took heart again in all the cities, but chiefly at Alexandria:
and Peter being then come back from Rome with letters
from Damaſus, which authoriz'd and confirm'd his election,
as well as the ² Nicene faith, the people turn'd out Lucius, ² Note 99.
receiv'd Peter in his place, and put the Churches into his
hands again. Lucius went away immediately to Conſtan-
tinople [to Valens,] who arriv'd there upon the 30th of
May this year: δ But he had other buſineſs to do, than to
think of reſtoring this wretch, [unleſs he was already dead
by the 9th of Auguſt.

It ſeems however that Lucius return'd to Alexandria, and
endeavour'd for ſome time to maintain his ground there,
if what S. Jerom ſays be true,] ε that he held the Church
of Alexandria till Theodoſius's reign, who turn'd him out;
ζ to which Theophanes who allows ſix years to his mock-
epiſcopate, agrees well enough. Nicephorus reckons but
five. η S. Jerom acquaints us, that he publiſh'd ſome ſmall
tracts upon ſeveral ſubjects, and that he even took upon
him to write Paſchal letters, as the Biſhops of Alexandria
us'd to do. [It is out of one of theſe letters and diſcour-
ſes upon the feſtival of Eaſter,] θ that the fragment is ta-
ken which is given us by an ancient author, by which we
find that he was as much an Apollinarian as an Arian, ſince

α Oroſ. l. 7. c. 33. p. 219. 2. a, b. β a. | Hier. chr. | Socr.
p. 252. d. | Soz. p. 696. c. γ Socr. l. 4. c. 35, 37. p. 252. d. |
254. | Soz. l. 6. c. 39. p. 702. b, c. δ Soz. p. 702. c.
ε Hier. v. ill. c. 118. p. 301. ζ Thphn. p. 56. c, d. η Hier.
p. 301. θ Bib. P. t. 4. part. 2. p. 1111. b.

A. D. 378. he says that the Word took only a body and not an human soul, and that with his body he had but one compounded nature.

[It was without doubt soon after Peter's return, that] *t* the sentence pronounc'd at Rome against the Apollinarians [in 377 or 378,] was confirm'd at Alexandria.

[Valens, as we just now said, was come to Constantinople to oppose the progress of the Goths.] *u* But he did not think that God brought him thither to punish him by the hands of these barbarians, [whom he had stir'd up against Jesus Christ,] and whom Jesus Christ had rais'd against him, because he had encourag'd the tongues of many blasphemers against truth, persecuted its defenders, and depriv'd the Churches of those who made it their business to get acquainted with it and to praise it. This was the charge which the holy hermit Isaac laid against him, when he left Constantinople to march against the Goths; and this Saint declar'd to him likewise, that if he did not immediately restore the faith he had endeavour'd to destroy, he would lose both his army and his life.

[3] This may be seen more at large in the history of Valens, where some other things may be met with that relate to the same subject. But we cannot but take notice likewise here, that he whom Valens chose for his chief minister in the war with the Goths, was General Sebastian, that Manichean who was so noted for the cruelties he had committed in Egypt in the year 356 in favour of the Arians. It was he who persuaded Valens to fight upon the 9th of August the unfortunate battle of Adrianople, in which he was kill'd with almost all the Roman army. Valens was wounded, but escap'd into a neighbouring house, which the Goths set fire to without knowing that he was there, and reduc'd it to ashes; so that he was depriv'd even of burial.

3 See Valens, §. 19, 20.

Gratian Valens's nephew, being by his death become Master of the East, immediately [4] made a law allowing all religions liberty of conscience, except the Manicheans, Photinians, and Eunomians. It was properly for the sake of the Catholicks of the East that he made this law, staying till the state of affairs would let him make others

4 See Gratian, §. 8.

t Ruf. l. 2. c. 20. p. 260. *u* Thdrt. l. 4. c. 31. p. 703. c, d. *x* Thdrt. l. 5. c. 2. p. 705. d. | Socr. l. 5. c. 2. p. 260. b. | Soz. l. 7. c. 1. p. 704, 705.

more

more advantageous to them.] λ But he made no delay to recall the exil'd Bishops to the government of their flocks, and by this he consecrated to God the first fruits of his new authority. A.D. 378.

μ Thus the holy Confessors were at length deliver'd from the bonds of their banishment, and return'd to their churches, after a thousand torments which they had suffer'd, ν of which some of them still carried the marks upon their bodies. ξ They brought likewise the relicks of those who were dead, and had finish'd their course in their banishment, [as perhaps of S. Barses. Some were without doubt receiv'd with joy by their people:] ο But the storm not being yet appeas'd every where, there were some who when they came home, underwent more misfortunes than they had suffer'd in their banishment, and were ston'd to death by the hereticks; [and it was thus that S. [5] Eusebius of Samosata completed his martyrdom in the year 380. As there were several Churches in the possession of the intruders whom the Arians had plac'd there;] π many of the Confessors who return'd from banishment, expressing more love for the unity of the Church, than regard to their dignity, consented that these Arians should continue Bishops, [if they would return to the faith and communion of the Orthodox,] and conjur'd them not to encrease the divisions of that one Church which Jesus Christ and his Apostles left us, and which disputes and an abominable desire of governing had torne into so many pieces. It was thus that Eulalius Bishop of Amasea in Pontus acted. He found [6] at his return, that the Arian who was plac'd in his see, had not fifty persons in the town that would own him: And yet to reunite even this small number to the Church, he offer'd to continue him in his dignity, or even to let him have the first place, that they might govern the people together with one consent. The Arian would not accept of this proposal, and shortly after these very people who own'd him, left him, and join'd the others.

[5] See his title, §. 10.

[6] See §. 116.

[The Church of Antioch would have been happy, if she could have met with the same good fortune, and have seen the dispute ended between S. Meletius and Paulinus. But God's providence did not grant this blessing so soon.

μ Thdrt. l. 5. c. 9. p. 714. d. ν p. 715. a. ξ p. 714. d.
ο p. 715. a. π Soz. l. 7. c. 2. p. 705, 706.

A. D. 378. For S. Meletius was acknowledg'd there for lawful pastor by almost all the orthodox,] ρ tho' Dorotheus still kept the Churches for the Arians; [and as all the Bishops of the East communicated only with this Saint, it was he who ordain'd Bishops in several cities of the East which had no Catholick ones. He plac'd the famous Diodorus at Tarsus, [7] and others at other places, some by himself, some by Eusebius of Samosata.]

7 See S. Meletius, § 12. and S. Eusebius of Samosata, §. 4, 9.

σ Sozomen says, that when Theodosius was made Emperor, [upon the 19th of January 379,] the Churches of the East were then in the hands of the Arians, except those of Jerusalem, [where [8] S. Cyril might perhaps be settled again by the death or expulsion of Hilario his competitor.] τ Gelasius S. Cyril's nephew was likewise restor'd to the see of Cæsarea the metropolis of Palestine, in the room of Euzoïus υ the Arian, φ who was turn'd out by Theodosius, [perhaps when the Churches were taken from the Arians at the beginning of the year 381.]

8 See his title, §. 4, 5.

χ What Sozomen says, that the Arians were masters of the Churches of the East, [must be understood, if it be true, not of the Empire, but of the Province of the East: For it is certain, that the Catholicks of Cæsarea, Iconium, and in all likelihood of many other cities of Asia Minor and Pontus, had always continued in possession of their Churches. There were only some cities of these provinces, that had seen their holy husbands banish'd, and adulterers take their places. That of Nyssa, which was one of this number, was one of the first that had the comfort of seeing their pastor S. Gregory again. For he was upon his return at the end of the year 378, since he was present at the death or at least at the funeral of his brother S. Basil.]

ρ Socr. l. 5. c. 3. p. 260 d.
τ Hier. v. ill. c. 130. p. 303. a.
φ Hier v. ill. c. 113. p. 300. d.
σ Soz. l. 7. c. 2. p. 705. c.
υ Epi. 73. c. 37. p. 885. b, c.
χ Soz. p. 705. c.

SEC-

A.D. 378.

SECTION CXXXV.

The Macedonians relapse or persevere in schism: S. Gregory Nazianzen re-establishes the faith at Constantinople.

† AS Gratian's law allow'd every body liberty of conscience, the Macedonians were resolv'd to make use of it. They had been reunited to the Church, [at least part of them,] after the famous deputation which they sent to Pope Liberius [in the year 366,] and from that time they had communicated every where, and particularly at Constantinople, with the defenders of the Consubstantiality. But after Gratian's law was made, they were not content with returning to their bishopricks, out of which the Arians had driven them, but they would likewise, if we may believe Socrates and Sozomen, separate from the communion of the Catholicks; and being assembled at Antioch for that end, they decreed that people must believe the Son to be like his Father in substance, and not communicate with those who held the Consubstantiality according to the definition of the Council of Nice. Some of them observ'd this decree, and held their congregations apart. But the greatest part of them not being able to bear with so many alterations in the faith, which seem'd to proceed only from [1] a spirit of division, left them entirely, and united more closely than ever with the Orthodox.

[1] φιλονεικίαν.

[A fact of this nature seems not well enough supported upon nothing but the evidence of Socrates and Sozomen. However it agrees well enough with what we meet with elsewhere, provided we distinguish things a little. For it really appears [2] by what we have said above, that the Macedonians were admitted as Catholicks, after they had been receiv'd by Liberius and the Council of Tyanæ: and S. Basil [3] labour'd still afterwards to unite them more and more to the Church. Their reunion was not however universal,] ω for immediately after the Council of Tyanæ thirty four Macedo-

[2] See §. 109.

[3] See his title §. 61. Note 4.

† Socr. l. 5. c. 4. p. 261. ‖ Soz. l. 7. c. 2. p. 705. c, d. ω Soz. l. 6. c. 12. p. 652. d.

A. D. 378. nian Bishops of the diocese of Asia held another Council in Caria, where they refus'd to receive the Consubstantiality. [Some of these thirty four were in all likelihood] α those of Lycia, whom S. Basil declares in 375 had a mind to join his communion.

[It is pretty probable, that those of these thirty four Bishops who persisted in schism, were they who held the Council we just now mention'd, at Antioch not in Syria, as we read in Socrates, (for we do not find that the Macedonians had much infected this province,) but in Caria [upon the Meander, as we read in Sozomen,] β who is follow'd by Nicephorus. [Thus these Macedonians must rather have persever'd in their heresy and schism, (which the persecution of the Arians seem'd to have extinguish'd,) than have renew'd it: tho' there were perhaps some among them that had communicated with the Church, who might leave it upon this occasion, to join their old companions of their heresy and schism. This was what Eustathius of Sebastia had partly done before, tho' he was one of the three Bishops who were sent to Pope Liberius.]

γ We find likewise by the course of the history and by S. Gregory Nazianzen, that the Macedonians form'd a separate body and communion from the Catholicks. δ This did not hinder them from looking upon them as friends, ε and from always preserving some regard for them, they not being quite dead, as the Arians were; ζ and this they did the more readily, because their life was perfectly edifying. η As to their doctrine, there were some of them who said publickly, that the Holy Ghost was a creature; and others durst not say either that he was a creature, or that he was God, θ alledging for excuse that the scripture did not speak clearly about it; ι and it was these last who S. Gregory said had some remains of life, κ and did partake in some measure of the Holy Spirit. [But the sequel, as Socrates relates it, shews pretty plainly, that they were not worthy of the affection and condescension that S. Gregory shew'd to them.

α Bas. ep. 403. p. 420. β Nphr. l. 12. c. 2. p. 362. c. γ Socr. l. 5. c. 8. p. 264. c. δ Naz. or. 44. p. 710. d. δ Naz. p. 709, 710. ε or. 37. p 600. d. ζ or. 44. p. 710, 711. η vit. p. 17. c. θ or. 37. p. 595. b. ι or. 44. p. 710. d. κ p. 709. d.

The

The advancement of the great Theodosius, to whom Gratian gave the Eastern Empire upon the 19th of January 379, was without doubt very afflicting to the Arians. For it was easy for them to imagine what they were to expect from a prince who had a great deal of piety, who had been always educated in the Nicene faith, who zealously lov'd it, and whose wife was the illustrious S. Flaccilla, no less firm than himself to the interest of the Church. We do not find however that he did any thing against the hereticks in this first year of his reign, for he was sufficiently employ'd in repelling the Goths, whom Valens's impiety more than his misfortune had made masters of several provinces of the Empire. So that the Arians continued as it were masters in the East, where they still possess'd the Churches in many cities. A. D. 379.

They particularly exercis'd their tyranny at Constantinople, [4] and the Catholicks had not so much as one place there to meet in. But as Valens's death began to give these last some liberty, they desir'd that S. Gregory Nazianzen might be sent to them, who had all the vertue, understanding, eloquence, and all the qualities that were necessary to enable him to restore the faith which was almost quite extinct in this capital city of the East: and what was pretty rare at that time, he had receiv'd episcopal ordination without being particularly fix'd in the service of any people; so that he was in a condition to go, like an Apostle, and preach the word of God every where, where the good of the Church call'd him. S. Eusebius of Samosata, who had been banish'd into Thrace by Valens, had without doubt made his vertue known there, with which he was perfectly well acquainted: and as he had continually apply'd himself in endeavouring to serve the Church, it cannot well be doubted but it was he who made the Orthodox of those quarters desire to have so great a man for their pastor.] [λ] For which reason, tho' they had had some thoughts of Bosphorus the old and famous Bishop of Colonia in Cappadocia, [they determin'd however to desire S. Gregory.

[4] See S. Gregory Nazianzen, Notes 24, 25.

All the difficulty was to get over the humility of this Saint, and his love of privacy; but he yielded at last to the importunities of S. Basil, S. Meletius, and many other great Bishops. He came therefore this year to Constantinople, authoriz'd it seems by some order from the Empe-

λ ep. 14. p. 777. a.

A. D. 379. ror, but otherwiſe without any other ſupport than the force of truth and the firmneſs of his faith. The Catholicks fitted up a little chappel for him, to which they gave the name of Anaſtaſis or Reſurrection, becauſe the true faith receiv'd there as it were new life. It was there that he began to bring the Catholicks together again privately, and to oppoſe all the hereticks who were in Conſtantinople, the Arians, the Eunomians, and the Macedonians.

But he oppos'd them leſs by his eloquence and the ſtrength of his arguments, which made the moſt learned and eloquent among them ſilent, than by the marks of bounty and affection which he ſhew'd them, as far as the intereſt of truth would allow him, tho' ſtill more by the patience with which he ſuffer'd their inſults and ill uſage. For they contemn'd the authority of the Emperor's orders, and attack'd him even ſometimes with open violence. A company of monks, falſe virgins, and beggars went one night from the great Church, and came and ſet upon him in his Anaſtaſis, profan'd the moſt holy places, follow'd him with ſhowers of ſtones, abus'd as much as they could the reſt of the Catholicks, of whom they left ſome for dead, and after that they had the impudence to drag him before the judges as a criminal. The fear of Theodoſius without doubt made the judges reſpect him more than the people did. The Arians found themſelves oblig'd to make ſome excuſes to him: But he would never require any other ſatisfaction.

Then they began to love and admire his vertue; the hereticks themſelves came to hear him with pleaſure; [μ] and the truths which he taught, entring their hearts by little and little, his flock encreas'd every day; and of a very ſmall one that it was at firſt, it became in a ſhort time very numerous.

μ Ruf. ap. Greg. Naz. t. 1. p. 727. [Thdrt. l. 5. c. 8. p. 712. d.

SEC-

A.D. 379.

SECTION CXXXVI.

Theodosius opposes the Arians by his laws; restores the Churches to the Catholicks.

[WE have seen that Gratian thought he did a great deal the preceding year for the Catholicks of the East, in restoring them to their liberty by giving it to almost all the sects. But after he had confin'd himself to the Western Empire, where this conduct was not necessary,] [v] he revok'd this general liberty by his law of the 3d of August 379, which forbids any of the hereticks to dispute and to hold any congregation. Theodosius in whose name likewise this law runs, [did not fail without doubt to have it executed all over his dominions. But he could not do it with the same ease as Gratian could, as well because the hereticks were very powerful there, as because it was even often difficult to distinguish them from the Catholicks, and this was what made him publish the law which we are going to mention.]

§ It was in 380 that Theodosius [1] receiv'd baptism from the hands of Ascolius a famous Bishop of Thessalonica, after having assur'd him that he profess'd the Catholick faith of Nice. He would likewise know of him the state of the Churches in the provinces which he possess'd, and he learnt of him to his sorrow that excepting Illyricum, all the rest were divided into a great number of sects, and the city of Constantinople more than any other. [This made him take the resolution to labour with vigor, but at the same time with wisdom, to cure so great an evil, for fear of provoking it by too violent remedies.] [o] He publish'd therefore upon the 28th of February a famous law, in which he declares that he will have all his subjects follow the faith that was taught [2] by Pope Damasus and Peter of Alexandria, that only those who do so, shall be look'd upon as Catholicks, and that all others shall be treated as hereticks and infamous persons, and punish'd several ways.

A.D. 380.

[1] See his title, §. 5.

[2] &c.

[v] Cod. Th. 16. t. 5. l. 5. p. 116, 117. Socr. l. 4. c. 6. p. 262, 263. [o] Cod. Th. 16. t. 1. p. 4, 5.

[This

A.D.380. [This law without doubt made a great many people and even Bishops return to the Church, who were receiv'd with a great deal and perhaps with too much readiness, as S. Gregory Nazianzen complains, and he imputes to them the faults that were afterwards committed in the Councils.

About the end of the following year people began to see a greater prospect of the fall of Arianism. [3] For Theodosius being come to Constantinople upon the 24th of November, he immediately commanded Demophilus to quit the churches, or embrace the Nicene faith. Demophilus finding that he was not in a condition to resist, quitted the churches upon the 26th of the same month, and Theodosius immediately put the Catholicks in possession of them, about forty years after the Arians had seiz'd upon them, when they turn'd out S. Paul.]

[3] See S. Gregory Nazianzen, §. 64.

π Socrates says, that Demophilus having receiv'd Theodosius's orders, gather'd his people together in the church, and made this speech to them: "My brethren, it is written in the Gospel: If they persecute you in one city, flee into another. Since therefore the Emperor has taken the Churches from us, I give you notice that the assembly will be held to morrow out of the town." After which he went, and held his congregations for the future [4] without the gates of Constantinople. Lucius who fled thither after his expulsion out of Alexandria, went out with him. ρ Philostorgius says, that the Arians and Eunomians were then banish'd the city by Theodosius: [But this seems difficult to us to believe.]

[4] Note 100.

σ The modern Greeks report, that the Arians being excluded the Churches of Constantinople, desir'd leave of Theodosius to dwell near that of S. Mocius, τ which was near the Dorian port, [and in all likelihood out of the town, and to rebuild it to hold their assemblies in:] υ For it was fallen down some years before. They obtain'd this favour, rebuilt the church, and perform'd their service there for seven years: But in the seventh year the church sunk while they were met there, and bruis'd a great many of them. It was rebuilt in Justinian's reign.

φ Their expulsion out of Constantinople [5] confounded their pride a little, but rais'd their fury. They would fain

[5] See S. Gregory Nazianzen, §. 67.

π Socr. l. 5. c. 7. p. 263, 264. ρ Phisg. l. 9. c. 19. p. 133. σ Codi. ori. p. 38. a. | 85. τ Cang. de C. l. 4. p. 130. υ Codi. p. 38. a. | 85. φ Naz. car. 1. p. 22, 23.

have

have even assassinated S. Gregory: But the hand of God stopt this blow; and S. Gregory by his mildness made his murderer his friend. He endeavour'd in the same manner to win the rest by his charity; [and as he made use of the power that Theodosius's favour gave him, only to prevent their insolence, he would not think at all of punishing the injuries they had done to the Catholicks in the preceding reigns.] χ By this moderation he gain'd a great number of people, enow to fill all the Churches of the Catholicks, [6] tho' the Arians had declar'd publickly that he would not have people to fill so much as the porches. A. D. 380. [6] ibid. §. 68.

[Theodosius soon did throughout the Empire what he had done at Constantinople.] ↓ For upon the 10th of January 381 [7] he publish'd a law, in which he forbids the Photinians, the Arians, the Eunomians, and in general all who did not follow the Nicene faith, to hold any congregation in the cities, ordering that all the Churches should be put into the possession of the Catholicks, and threatning to banish those out of the towns who should make any disturbance. ω General Sapor was charg'd with the execution of this law, and he did it [in the beginning of this year with a great deal of zeal,] without meeting with any [considerable] resistance any where, [not through the moderation of the hereticks, but through their fear of the Emperor.] α For after they were even entirely turn'd out of the churches which they had possess'd, they did not cease to set up new congregations, to pervert those who were not sufficiently upon their guard, to raise seditions among the people, and to do all that they could to disturb the Church. A. D. 381. [7] See Theodosius I. §. 9.

β The law of the tenth of January seems absolutely to forbid the hereticks from having any congregation. γ However at last the prohibition was restrain'd to the towns, without mentioning any thing more. δ And this without doubt is what they were contented to have executed. ε At least we have seen, that at Constantinople Theodosius let them meet out of the city: ζ And the same is likewise said of those of Antioch.

χ p. 24. a. ↓ Cod. Th. 16. t. 5. l. 6. p. 117, 118. ω Thdrt. l. 5. c. 2. p. 706. a, b. α c. 9. p 715. c. β Cod. Th. 16. t. 5. l. 6. p. 117. γ p. 118. δ p. 119. 2. ε Socr. l. 5. c. 7. p. 264. a. | Soz. l. 7. c. 5. p. 709. c. ζ Socr. l. 5. c. 15. p. 274. b.

η Philo-

A.D. 381. η Philostorgius assures us, that several Arian Bishops seeing themselves excluded the cities [and the favour of the Court,] left their people, and dispers'd themselves several ways: Among others he takes notice of Hypatius of Nice, who went to Cyrus in the [Euphratesian] Syria, the place of his birth, and Dorotheus of Antioch, who retir'd into Thrace, which was his own country. θ And yet Dorotheus was still at Antioch, according to Socrates and Sozomen, in the year 386, from whence he was call'd to Constantinople by the Arians.

ι Philostorgius adds, that Dorotheus being gone from Antioch, Asterius, Crispinus, and the other [Arian] Priests held an assembly with some Bishops of the neighbouring cities, and sent to Eunomius or the Eunomians, desiring to join their communion; to which these said they consented, provided the Arians would annull the condemnation of Aëtius and his writings [pass'd at Constantinople in 360,] and would correct the abuses that had crept in among them. The Arians laugh'd at their demands, as unreasonable and insolent, and cried out publickly against them and their Chief. [It appears however by the very title of the homilies which S. Chrysostom made against them, that they pass'd for Anomœans.]

SECTION CXXXVII.

The death of Peter Bishop of Alexandria: Timothy succeeds him: Several laws against the Arians.

[SINCE our subject has oblig'd us hitherto to join to the history of Arianism that of Peter of Alexandria,
[1] Note 101. we must likewise give an account of his death, [1] which happen'd in the beginning of this year, and probably upon the 14th of February,] κ upon which day the Egyptians honour one of their Patriarchs call'd Peter; [and every

η Philsg. l. 9. c. 19. p. 133. θ Socr. l. 5. c. 12. p. 271. c. Soz. l. 7. c. 14. p. 722. d. ι Philsg. l. 10 c. 1. p. 134. κ Boll. 2. may, p. 247. f.

thing

thing concurs to make us believe he is this man. And indeed there is no reason to doubt but the Church of Alexandria honour'd the memory of a Prelate, who pass'd for one of the greatest men of his age. We have [2] taken notice above of the encomiums that have been given him; and how after having succeeded the great S. Athanasius in the year 373, he immediately underwent a very sharp persecution, which oblig'd him to retire to Rome. A.D. 381.

[2] See §. 122.

S. Basil who had [3] courted his friendship upon his entring upon the episcopate, kept up this holy correspondence with him during his banishment. His stay at Rome gave him an opportunity of joining with Pope Damasus [4] in the condemnation of the Apollinarians in 377 or 378. He wrote likewise against them at the same time, and endeavour'd to satisfy S. Basil upon [5] some particular affair. Afterwards he return'd gloriously to Alexandria in 378, while [6] Valens himself was living, and receiv'd at the beginning of the year 380 an illustrious testimony of his merit in Theodosius's law.

[3] See S. Basil, §. 96, 126, 129.

[4] See the Apollinarians, §. 11.

[5] See S. Basil, §. 129.

[6] See §. 134.

It is pretended, that he was suspected of taking money to receive the hereticks into the Church; but as this report is not prov'd, it will not hinder his episcopate from having been entirely without blame, excepting the fault he did [7] in favouring the intrusion of Maximus in opposition to S. Gregory Nazianzen, whom he had install'd himself as much as was in his power in the same see. He cannot be justified in this point, by laying his fault upon Timothy his successor,] λ as Theodorit has done: μ And there is no possibility of withstanding S. Gregory's authority, ν and that of the Council of Italy; [any more than the order of time: And all that we can say in his favour, is that God did not stay to punish him for his crime in the other world, the same Maximus whom he had a mind to place in the see of Constantinople, having almost robb'd him of that of Alexandria. So that it appears he was friends again with S. Gregory, who after this bestow'd great encomiums upon him in [8] his 24th oration. As he did not die till the beginning of this year, he had the satisfaction of seeing the reign of Arianism at an end by the law of the tenth of January, after having seen the beginning and dreadful progress of it whilst he follow'd S. Athanasius, and after having felt him-

[7] See S. Gregory Nazianzen, §. 60.

[8] See S. Gregory Nazianzen, §. 69.

λ Thdrt. l. 5. c. 8. p. 713. a. μ Bar. 380. §. 14. ν Cod. Th. app. p. 104.

self

A. D. 381. self the violence and fury of it. He must have govern'd seven years and a little above nine months after S. Athanasius's death, and about two years and an half after his own restoration, which is said to have been before Valens's death.]

ξ Timothy his brother was likewise his successor. ο He had been, as well as Peter, S. Athanasius's disciple, and gloried in esteeming what this great Saint had esteem'd. π He was chosen by the consent of all the Bishops of Egypt to be their Chief, and approv'd by the judgment of Theodosius, who gives him this character, that he deserv'd the respect of all the Prelates. ρ The Westerns granted him their communion without any difficulty. He was however troubled by some persons, whose faith it is said had not always been very right; σ and the Council of Aquilea demanded this year that a General Council should be held at Alexandria, to finish this affair and some others. [We know not either what it was, or what came of it.

He was sent for to Constantinople almost as soon as he was made Bishop, to be present at the conclusion of the
9 ibid. General Council; and what he did there, may be seen 9 in another place. This is almost the only thing that is known of him, his episcopate not being famous in history: But we cannot forget an answer he made upon the account of an holy hermit nam'd Ammonius.] τ For a Church having desir'd of him to have this hermit for their Bishop, and he having answer'd that they had nothing to do but to bring him to him, and he would ordain him immediately, they went to seek him in his desart, resolving to bring him by force. Ammonius fled at this news: but being taken, and seeing that all the prayers and protestations he could make to avoid the episcopate, signified nothing, at last he cut off his ear, the law forbiding any one that has this defect, to be rais'd to the Priesthood. But when this story was told Timothy, he made this answer: "This law is a good one "for the Jews; but bring me a man that has his nose cut "off, if you will, provided that he has a good character "and is fit for the episcopate, I should not refuse to ordain him."

ξ Socr. l. 4. c. 37. p. 254. c. | Soz. l. 7. c. 7. p. 711. c. ο Fac. l. 4. c. 2. p. 151. b. π Cod. Th. app. p. 10. ρ p. 75. σ p. 77. | Conc. t. 2. p. 1000. d. τ Laus. c. 12. p. 914. c, d.

υ Theo-

υ Theodosius the Emperor speaks [10] very honourably of the same Timothy in an important rescript directed to Optatus the Prefect of Egypt, forbidding the secular judges to meddle in ecclesiastical affairs, and ordering them to leave them to the Bishops of the places, as in Egypt to Timothy, whose very person was worthy of that honour. φ The Council of Galatia in 458 calls him an apostolical man, perfectly irreproachable both in his words and actions. χ Others give him the surname of [11] poor, [which is a glorious title for a Bishop, and a Bishop of Alexandria.] There is some mention made [12] of one of his uncles and cousin-germans who had embrac'd the solitary life at Alexandria.

A. D. 381.

10 See Theodosius I. §. 20.

11 ἀκτήμων.

12 See S. Arsenius, Note.

ϒ Facundus has preserv'd us a letter from him to Diodorus of [Tyre.] ω We have likewise a canonical epistle of his, which is confirm'd by the first Canon of the Council in *Trullo*. α Sozomen acquaints us, that he wrote an history of Apollos, and of many other illustrious hermits of Egypt, [which might perhaps serve for memoirs for that of Palladius: And Rufinus perhaps means this,] β when he says that others before him had given an account of the miracles of S. Macarius of Alexandria. γ He died [13] in 385 upon Sunday the twentieth of July: [and thus he govern'd but four years, five months, and six days.] δ Theophilus, of whom there is no occasion to say any thing here, was his successor.

13 Note 102.

ε The General Council at which we said Timothy was present, was held this year at Constantinople in May. [In that synod they settled the manner how the Arians should be treated, and the other hereticks who desir'd to be reunited to the Church. [14] As the Macedonians seem'd to be at a less distance from truth than the Arians,] ζ Theodosius made them come to the Council, hoping they might be recover'd. There were about thirty six of them present, most of them Bishops of Hellespont, having for their Chiefs the old Eleusius of Cyzicus, and Marcian of Lampsacus. [But if they were not so far remov'd as others from the faith of the Church, they were from her unity as

14 See S. Gregory Nazianzen. §. 77.

υ Cod. Th. app. p. 9, 10. φ Conc. t. 4. p 971. b. χ Cotel. g. t. 1. p. 366. a, b. ϒ Fac. l. 4. c. 2. p. 151. ω Bar. 386. §. 30. α Soz. l. 6. c. 29. p. 680. a. β Ruf. v. Pat. c. 29. p. 480. 2. γ Socr. l. 5. c. 12. p. 271. b, c. δ Thdrt. l. 5. c. 22. p. 735. c. & alii. ε Socr. l. 5. c. 8. p. 264. d. ζ c. 7. p. 264. a, d. | Soz. l. 7. c. 7. p. 711. c.

much

A. D. 381. much as the most obstinate schismaticks.] ν For notwithstanding all the exhortations that the Emperor and the Catholick Bishops 15 could make to them, they contemn'd both their desires and their arguments; and without so much as troubling themselves about the declarations they had sent to Liberius, they declar'd that they would sooner embrace the belief of the Arians than the Consubstantial faith. Upon this they retir'd, and wrote every where to their followers, exhorting them never to receive the Nicene faith.

15 &c.

θ One of the consequences of this Council was the law of the 30th of July, ι in which Theodosius order'd [again,] that all the Churches should be put into the hands of the Bishops of the Catholick communion, without allowing the others to have any of them. κ Upon the 19th of the same month he made another against the Arians and Eunomians in particular, forbidding them to build any Church either in town or country, upon pain of forfeiting the ground where it should be built.

[What we have said about the Church of S. Mocius which was held by the Arians till 387, may seem contrary to these laws. But they had rebuilt it, and had not taken it from the Catholicks, which may except it in some measure from the law of the 30th of July. As for the other, that only mentions the churches they should build for the future. We find even that these laws were not very strictly executed, since they were often oblig'd to repeat them.] λ And indeed Socrates assures us, that Theodosius did not aim so much at punishing the hereticks, as at intimidating them, to make them return to the Church; 16 and that he suffer'd them to hold their congregations, and to have churches, provided they were not in the towns.

16 See Theodosius I. §. 64.

[The Westerns labour'd at the same time in extirpating the remains of Arianism in their provinces, and 17 the Council of Aquilea depos'd upon the third of September Palladius and Secundianus Arian Bishops of Illyricum.]

17 See S. Ambrose, §. 26.

ν Socr. p. 264, 265. | Soz. p. 711, 712. θ Soz. l. 7. c. 9. p. 715. ι Cod. Th. 16. t. 7. l. 3. p. 9. κ t. 5. l. 8. p. 128. λ Socr. l. 5. c. 20. p. 280. b. | Soz. l. 7. c. 12. p. 719. d.

SEC-

SECTION CXXXVIII.

Theodosius assembles all the sects at Constantinople to unite them.

[WE meet with nothing particular concerning the Arians in the year 382.] μ It is only certain, that they continued to disturb [1] the Catholicks as much as they could, ν in order to keep their churches, or to be reveng'd for being turn'd out of them. [It is not said that they were so bold as to raise seditions in Constantinople;] ξ but they gave themselves very great liberties there in maintaining their errors and disputing against the true faith in the middle of publick places and assemblies, [not troubling themselves much about Nectarius, who was a weak mild man, and had neither the zeal, nor knowledge, nor eloquence of S. Gregory Nazianzen to oppose them with.] ο This city was full of people, who from mechanicks, footmen, and other such like professions, set up all at once for Divines and Teachers, and fill'd the streets and publick places with disputants. If you would change a piece of money, as S. Gregory Nyssen pleasantly says when he is describing this frensy, (for that is the name he gives it,) they make long discourses to you about the difference between the begotten Son and the unbegotten Father: If you ask what price bread goes at, they answer you, that the Father is greater, and the Son inferior to him: If you are in haste to know when the bath will be hot enough, instead of satisfying you, they assure you very seriously that the Son sprang out of nothing. A. D. 383. [1] &c.

π Theodosius, who desir'd nothing so much as to see his State settled in peace, thought he could put an end to all these differences, and unite the several sects that caus'd them, if he made the heads of them meet together, to confer with one another upon all the points in dispute among them, hoping by this means to get them all to agree in the same tenets. He sent for them all therefore to Constanti-

μ Thdrt. l. 5. c. 9. p. 715. c. ν Socr. l. 5. c. 10. p. 266. d. | Soz. l. 7. c. 12. p. 717, 718. ξ Naz. car. 58. p. 134. c, d. ο Nyss. de Abr. p. 466. c, d. π Socr. p. 267. a. | Soz. p. 718. a.

A.D. 383. nople, whither they came in the year 383 ρ in June. σ The division of the Church of Antioch which still continued between Flavian S. Meletius's successor and Paulinus, and which made a great deal of noise the year before, might likewise be one of the occasions of calling this assembly.

[It was a Council of all the East,] τ for there were Bishops present at it even from Egypt, Arabia, Cyprus, Palestine, Phœnicia, and Syria. υ S. Gregory Nazianzen wrote from his retreat to Posthumianus, exhorting him to restore peace to the Churches in the Council that was met, and even to make use of force to correct those who would keep up division.

φ Posthumianus was then in possession of the highest of dignities, [[z] that is, he was Prefect of the East, Theodosius having made him so in the beginning of the year 383. So that this letter of S. Gregory's sufficiently confirms Socrates and Sozomen, in their placing a new assembly of Bishops in this year. But as to all they say of it, that has no other authority than that of these historians, who are wont to relate the truest facts in a very confus'd and unexact method, and to perplex them with very suspicious and often false circumstances. In this manner our readers must take what we are going to relate after them, not meeting with any better authors who speak of it; and we hope to find pardon, if in relating what they say, we take notice of what seems to us to be defective or faulty in their account.]

[z] See Theodosius 1. §. 13.

χ Of all the Bishops who were present at this Council, these historians name only Nectarius for the Catholicks, Agelius Bishop of the Novatians, Demophilus for the Arians, Eunomius for those of his sect, and Eleusius of Cyzicus for the Macedonians. ψ It is thought that S. Amphilochius was there; [and the same must be said likewise of S. Gregory Nyssen,] ω for his discourse upon the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost, and upon Abraham's sacrifice, was [a] pronounc'd at Constantinople in an assembly of Bishops in the middle of the year 383. α The Bishops had brought with them a great many Logicians to manage the disputes.

[a] See S. Gregory Nyssen, §. 10.

β Before the conference began, Theodosius told Nectarius, that in order to unite all the Churches, they must se-

ρ Socr. p. 267. b. σ c. 9, 10. p. 266, 267, 269. c, d. τ c. 10. p. 269. c, d. υ Naz. ep. 71. p. 828. φ p. 828. χ Socr. l. 5. c. 10. p. 267. b, c. ψ Bar. 383. §. 32. ω Nyss. de Abr. p. 467. α Socr. p. 268. c. β p. 267. b, c.

riously

rioufly examine the point that caus'd the diviſion between them. Nectarius very much troubled at this propoſal, went to conſult with Agelius Biſhop of the Novatians, if we keep to Socrates's account: [But whatever incapacity may be preſum'd to be in Nectarius, it will be very difficult to be perſuaded that it was ſo great as this fact makes it.] γ And Agelius, who had, as they ſay, a good deal of vertue, but no great talent at diſputing, made Siſinnius his Reader anſwer for him. [So that the Church at a time when it was beſt ſtock'd with great and learned men, was reduc'd to take advice in an affair of the utmoſt importance of a Novatian Reader,] δ who among the fine qualities which are given him, had been a fellow-pupil with Julian the Apoſtate under Maximus the philoſopher [a celebrated magician.] A. D 383.

ε Siſinnius who knew that diſputes inſtead of uniting thoſe who are divided, only made them the more obſtinate, ſaid that it was neceſſary to cut them off if it could be done, and deſir'd the aſſembly might be aſk'd by the Emperor, whether they would regard the Fathers who liv'd before theſe diviſions, or reject their doctrine, and by conſequence anathematize them: That as no body durſt ſay the latter, for fear of being condemn'd by his own followers; they muſt receive the authority of the Fathers, and that thus there would be nothing to do but to produce their paſſages to ſhew the eternity of the Son, which would be very eaſy. [As there was no occaſion to recur to Siſinnius to know, that the authority of the Fathers makes part of the rule of faith; ſo neither was it the way to cut off diſputes, to be judg'd entirely by what could be cited from them, for thoſe who did not yield to the texts of the Goſpel, would not fail to quibble upon the opinions of the Fathers. Neither can it be pretended, that the Catholicks would ever conſent to abandon in any manner the Council and creed of Nice.]

ζ However Nectarius overjoy'd with this good advice, runs to the palace to tell Theodoſius of it, who was mightily pleas'd with it, and did not fail to execute it with art and cunning; and it ſucceeded, ſay they, as well as could be wiſh'd. For as all the aſſembly had declar'd their reve-

γ c, d. δ c. 21. p. 280. c, d. ε c. 10. p. 267, 268. ζ p. 268. b, c, d.

A.D. 383. rence for the ancient Fathers as their Doctors and teachers; when Theodosius ask'd them whether then they would submit to them as judges of the contested points, they knew not what to answer; not only the several sects, but likewise those of the same party were divided, some being for acknowledging the authority of the Fathers, and others for rejecting it. So that the Emperor perceiv'd, that these hereticks depended upon their own reasonings, [4] and not upon the doctrine of the Ancients, [as if he had doubted of it,] [η] and express'd his dissatisfaction against such behaviour.

4 &c.

θ Afterwards he had a mind to try another method, and order'd each party to bring him by a certain day a plain exposition of their belief. The day being come, he receiv'd all these expositions, and fervently pray'd to God to assist him in the choice of the truth; and after having read them all, he approv'd only of those of the Novatians and the Catholicks, and tore all the rest in pieces. [Theodosius then, according to this story, made himself judge of the doctrine of the Church. He must likewise have been in doubt, either really or seemingly about the true faith, for otherwise he had nothing to do but to ask for so many professions of faith, and choose that which was the most orthodox. All these things are unworthy of Theodosius's piety. For which reason, if there is any thing true in this account, it was without doubt attended with such circumstances, as would give us a quite different idea of it. In the mean time it is certain, that the Catholicks gain'd the victory:] [ι] But not an entire one, because they were divided among themselves upon the affair of Paulinus and Flavian of Antioch. [κ] We meet likewise with a pretty long profession of faith, or rather of error, compos'd by Eunomius, to present to the Emperor, who had demanded it of him: And Valesius does not doubt but it was made for the assembly we are speaking of.

λ The result of these conferences was, that the heads of the hereticks were condemn'd by their own disciples, [μ] of whom a great many left them, when they found them agree so ill among themselves. [ν] So they retir'd very

η Soz. l. 7. c. 12. p. 719. b. θ Socr. p. 268. d. ι p. 269. d.
κ n. p. 61. 2. a. --- 64. λ l. 5. c. 10. p. 269. b, c. | Soz. p. 719. c.
μ Soz. p. 719. c. ν Socr. p. 269. c.

much

much vex'd and troubled: But for all that, they wrote to their followers, exhorting them to take courage, and not be cast down at seeing so many people embrace the Consubstantiality; for, said they, many are called, but few chosen. But they did not say this, when they drew almost all the people to their side by the strength of the imperial authority. A.D. 383.

SECTION CXXXIX.

S. Amphilochius artfully obliges Theodosius to forbid the hereticks to meet.

ξ BAronius places [1] at this time the conference that Theodosius would have had with Eunomius, according to Sozomen, and a remarkable action of S. Amphilochius's which this historian joins with it. ο As the Arians, says Sozomen, tho' depriv'd of the churches at Constantinople, continued there in great numbers, because of the interest they had had in Valens's reign, π they propagated publickly in the congregations the opinions they had of God and of the divine substance; and they even pretended to make an attempt upon Theodosius by means of their followers who were at Court, [endeavouring to have a dispute before him between them and the Catholicks.] For they hoped to gain him this way, because Eunomius was a good disputant. [Sozomen will have it therefore, that it was the Eunomians who possess'd the Churches in Valens's reign; and yet it was the Arians properly so call'd, or Eudoxians, who were enemies to Eunomius and his sect.] ρ Theodosius, continues Sozomen, was not averse against seeing Eunomius; σ which was a great trouble to the Catholicks: τ But his wife Flaccilla the Empress, a princess extremely zealous for the Nicene faith, υ and who abhorr'd the Arians as idolaters, φ prevented this conference, for fear her husband should be impos'd upon by Eunomius's artifices.

[1] Note 103.

ξ Bar. 383. §. 32, 33. ο Soz. l. 7. c. 6. p. 709. d. π p. 710. a. ρ b. σ a. τ b. υ Nyss. de Flac. p. 533. b. φ Soz. p. 710. b.

A. D. 383. tifices. χ Some can hardly be perſuaded that Theodoſius ever had any deſign to ſee Eunomius. [It is perhaps ſtill more difficult to believe, that the Catholicks were in ſo much dread of ſuch a man as this Arch-heretick was. But we relate what we meet with.]

ψ This affair was not yet ended, when an accident happen'd which very much confirm'd Theodoſius in his averſion againſt the hereticks. Among the Prelates who came to Conſtantinople, there was, ſays Sozomen, an old Biſhop of a town no ways conſiderable, who was as underſtanding in affairs of religion, as he was ignorant and unskilful in thoſe of the world. [Sozomen is miſtaken according to his uſual cuſtom † in the circumſtances:] ω For Theodorit tells us, that this Prelate was S. Amphilochius, [an underſtanding man in every thing, and metropolitan of Iconium, a noted and conſiderable city.] α This Saint was come to wait upon Theodoſius, to prevail with him to forbid the [2]Note 104. Arians to hold their congregations in the towns, [2] or rather not to let them hold any either in town or country;] and Theodoſius who thought this too ſevere, would not grant it. The Saint withdrew at that time without ſaying any thing; but afterwards he obtain'd what he deſir'd, and by a piece of art which is worth taking notice of.

β He came to the palace with ſome other Biſhops to wait upon the Emperor, and paid him, as the reſt did, all the uſual ceremonies: γ but tho' he ſaw Arcadius, who had been declar'd Auguſtus a little while before, ſitting next to Theodoſius, his father, he took no notice of him. Theodoſius thought he forgot him, and bid him come and pay his reſpects to his ſon, and kiſs his hand. The Saint came up to the young prince, δ and made much of him as he would of any other child, but did not ſhew that regard to him that us'd to be given to Emperors; ε and addreſſing himſelf to Theodoſius, he told him that it was enough that he had diſcharg'd the uſual ceremonies to himſelf, without paying them likewiſe to Arcadius. Theodoſius took fire at this, as being abus'd in the perſon of his ſon, ζ and or-

χ n. p. 150. 1. b. ψ l. 7. c. 6. p. 710. c. ω Thdrt. l. 5. c. 16. p. 725. a. α a. β b. | Soz. p. 710. c. γ Thdrt. p. 725. b. δ Soz. p. 710. d. ε Thdrt. p. 725. b. ζ Soz. p. 710 d.

† Valeſius (*Soz. n.* 150. 1. *c, d.*) chooſes rather to think, that Sozomen and Theodorit ſpeak of two different perſons. [But the circumſtances are too like.]

der'd

der'd the Bishop out of his presence. But as they were pushing him to make him go out, he turn'd to Theodosius, η and cried out: "You see, an't please your Majesty, that "you cannot bear the injury that is done to your son, "but are transported with anger against those who do not "treat him with respect." θ Doubt not but the God of "the universe has the same abhorrence of those who blaspheme his only Son, in not paying him the same honours as are given to himself, and detests them as people "ungrateful to their benefactor and Saviour." ι Theodosius immediately took his meaning, and admir'd the art of this holy Bishop. κ He call'd him back, ask'd his pardon, λ and order'd the law to be drawn up presently that he had desir'd of him, forbidding the hereticks to assemble together. A.D. 383.

[This was probably] μ the law of the 25th of July this year, directed to Posthumianus the Prefect, ν which absolutely forbids the hereticks, as the Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, Manicheans, to [3] hold any congregation either in publick places or private houses; and that any body may disperse them, if they hold any. ξ The law of the 3d of September following positively adds the Apollinarians, whom it forbids, as well as the Arians, Eunomians, and Macedonians, to assemble together either in the towns or even in the country; and orders that all the houses made use of for such assemblies, shall be forfeited to the Exchequer; that they shall not be allow'd to ordain any Bishop, [as they had done at Nazianzum;] and that the magistrates and officers of justice who do not take care to have all these things executed, shall answer for it in their own persons. [3] &c.

ο This law orders likewise, that search shall be made after those who us'd to teach the doctrine of the hereticks, and to preside in their assemblies, [that is the Bishops, and perhaps the Priests likewise;] and that they should be sent to the places of their birth, with a prohibition not to leave them. [I do not know whether it is to this that we must refer what we said of Dorotheus of Antioch and Hypatius of Nice, who retir'd to their own countries.] π Sozomen says likewise, that Theodosius banish'd several

η Thdrt. p. 725. b, c. θ c. ι Soz. p. 710. d. ι Thdrt. p. 725. c. κ Soz. p. 711. a. λ Thdrt. p. 725. c. μ Bar. 383. §. 35. ν Cod. Th. 16. t. 5. l. 11. p. 126. ξ l. 12. p. 127. ο ibid. π Soz. l. 7. c. 12. p. 719. d.

A. D. 383. heretical Biſhops out of the cities and countries, [of which they pretended to be Biſhops.] ρ He adds, that this Prince ſent the heads of the ſects to deſart places, particularly Eunomius; σ that he declar'd ſeveral of them infamous, and depriv'd them of the freedom of citizens; τ that he forbad all [religious] meetings and diſputes in publick places; and that he order'd puniſhments againſt thoſe who would diſcourſe there upon the divine ſubſtance and nature. υ Upon the 20th of June this year, Theodoſius ſpeaking of thoſe ancient hereticks call'd Taſcogrudites, ſaid that it was not neceſſary to baniſh them their country, but that they ſhould not be ſuffer'd to hold any aſſembly, and that if they did they muſt be diſpers'd immediately.

ρ l. 6. c. 26. p. 674, 675. σ l. 7. c. 12. p. 719. d. τ c. 6 p. 711. a. υ Cod. Th. 16. t. 5. l. 10. p. 125.

SECT.

SECTION CXL.

The gentleneſs of Theodoſius towards the Novatians and ſome other hereticks: New laws againſt the Arians; they divide among themſelves, and riſe in arms at Conſtantinople.

THE ſeverity of Theodoſius's laws obliging many of the Arian Biſhops to fly and hide themſelves, [there were without doubt ſeveral of them who thought they could not find a ſafer place of retreat than Conſtantinople. This was probably the reaſon that induc'd Theodoſius to make] the law of the 21ſt of January 384, in which he orders Cynegius the *Præfectus Prætorio* to make an exact enquiry after all the Eunomian, Macedonian, Arian, and Apollinarian Biſhops or miniſters who might be hid in Conſtantinople, and to ſend them all away without exception. φ A. D. 384.

[The Novatians are not mention'd in any of theſe laws, which Theodoſius made againſt the hereticks: and we muſt not wonder at it, if what Socrates ſays be true, who was very favourable to this ſect,] χ that the conference at Conſtantinople gain'd them Theodoſius's favour, becauſe they had acknowledg'd the Conſubſtantiality with the Catholicks; ſo that they were allow'd, as he ſays, to have ſome churches in the cities, and to enjoy ſome of the ſame privileges with the Catholicks. [This is not incredible, the greateſt Princes being ſubject to commit faults, both through their own weakneſs, and through the evil counſels of others.] ψ We have likewiſe a reſcript of the ſame nature, which he granted in 384 to the Luciferians.

ω S. Gregory Nazianzen [1] was alſo oblig'd [in 385 or afterwards] to complain to Nectarius, that the Arians, Eunomians, and Macedonians [2] took a great deal of liberty, and that the Apollinarians had even obtain'd leave to aſſemble together as the Catholicks did. α It is thought that

[1] See his title, §. 103.
[2] &c.

φ Cod. Th. 16. t. 5. l. 13. p. 129. not. 20. p. 269. b. 280. b. χ Socr. l. 5. c. 10, ψ Mar. & F. p. 100. ω Naz. or. 46. p. 421. α Cod. Th. t. 6. p. 130. 1.

this

A.D. 384. this happen'd particularly in the three following years, during which time we do not meet with any law against the hereticks, the Code not mentioning any from that of the 21st of January 384 to the 9th of March 388. [The death of the Empress Flaccilla, which happen'd about the end of the year 385, contributed perhaps towards the quiet which the hereticks enjoy'd.

[a] See S. Ambrose, §. 38.

The same year 385, [a] there were some apprehensions of the reign of Arianism being establish'd again in the West, by means of the Empress Justina, who profess'd that heresy. She reign'd over Italy, Illyricum, and Africa, in the name of her son Valentinian the younger: But whatever authority she had, the couragious resistance of S. Ambrose stopt the impetuosity of this torrent; and a second Auxentius, to whom she had caus'd to be given the title of Archbishop of Milan, could not so much as get one single church there.

A.D. 386. [b] Ibid. §. 434--5.

Justina continued her efforts this year [b] against the Catholick faith, and she even publish'd a law upon the 21st of January to restore the authority of the Council of Ariminum, and to forbid under pain of death the disturbance of those who follow'd its doctrine. But her fury was oblig'd to yield both to S. Ambrose's resolution, and to the power of the miracles which God wrought by the relicks of S. Gervasius and S. Protasius.]

β Demophilus who govern'd the Arians at Constantinople [ever since the year 370,] died this year 386; and they put in his place one Marinus, whom they brought from Thrace, where it seems he was already Bishop of some Church of theirs. He did not keep this dignity long. For the Arians themselves having sent for Dorotheus their Bishop to Antioch, they acknowledg'd him for their Chief instead of Marinus; which caus'd a division among them: γ and it began [c] this very year, δ tho' some do not place it till the year 394.

[c] Note 105.

ε For as the quibbling questions which they debated every day, made them often fall into strange absurdities, they had a mind once to dispute whether it might be said, that God was Father before the existence of the Son: for they all suppos'd that the Son began to exist. Dorotheus main-

β Socr. l. 5. c. 12. p. 271. c. | Soz. l. 7. c. 14. p. 712. c, d.
γ Socr. l. 5. c. 23. p. 292. a, c. δ n. p. 73. 1. a. ε l. 5. c. 23. p. 291. b, c, d.

tain'd,

tain'd, that this could not be said: and Marinus, who thought that he had now an opportunity of revenging himself upon Dorotheus who was prefer'd before him, maintain'd the contrary. This dispute occasion'd an open rupture between them; each held his congregations apart; and the places where they held them before, being in the possession of Dorotheus, Marinus sought out and built new ones. A. D. 386.

ζ The party of the latter receiv'd a great addition from the Goths, and even took its name from them, these barbarians [who were in great numbers in Theodosius's troops, especially after the year 382,] having almost all of them follow'd it after the example of Selenas their Bishop, to whose opinion they paid a very great deference, as well because of Ulphilas his predecessor, whose [6] secretary he had been, as because of the advantage he had of speaking both the Gothick and the Greek language, η his father being a Goth and his mother a Phrygian. θ Besides the name of Goths, this party had likewise that of Psathyrians, because of one Theoctistus a Syrian, who was a zealous defender of them, and whose trade was making certain cakes which the Greeks call Psathyres. ι This name was given them by the people of Antioch.

[6] γραμματεὺς.

κ Their branch was afterwards subdivided into two others, upon the account of the differences which Agapius had upon the point of primacy with Marinus, who had made him Bishop of Ephesus. Agapius was follow'd by the Goths, λ and they gave this party the name of Curcians or Pithecians, (that is monkeys,) because of one among them [nam'd Curcius,] who was extremely little and very crooked.

[But as God permits evil only to bring good out of it,] μ a great many of the Ecclesiasticks not being able to bear these divisions and schims, which were founded upon nothing but ambition and vain-glory, left the Arian party, and join'd the Catholick communion.

ν The Arians continued thus divided for thirty five years, after which the Psathyrians of Constantinople were at length reunited to the other Arians, ξ at the persuasion of Plinthas, a Consul, and a very powerful man in the reign of Theo-

ζ d. | Soz. l. 7. c. 17. p. 730. b, c. η Socr. l. 291. d. θ d. | Soz. p. 730. b. ι Thdrt. hær. l. 4. c. 4. p. 238. b. κ Socr. p. 292. a. | Soz. p. 730. c. λ Thdrt. hær. p. 238. b. μ Socr. p. 292. a. | Soz. p. 730. d. ν ibid. ξ Soz. p. 730. d.

dosius

A.D.386. dosius the younger, and General of the Roman cavalry and infantry, but an Arian, ο of the sect of the Psathyrians. π The condition of the accommodation was that there should be no more mention of the question that had divided them. [This condition is very reasonable in School-disputes, but it would be very dangerous in the truths of faith.] ρ There were none but the Arians of Constantinople who were reunited; and their schism continued in the other cities where their heresy had reach'd.

σ Theodorit speaks likewise of another branch, which separated afterwards from the Arians: They were call'd Doulians or Servants, because they said that the Son of God was the Father's servant. [We have [7] spoken above of the names Exacionites and Troglites which were likewise given the Arians; and we have [8] also taken notice of what we find concerning the divisions in the sect of the Eunomians.

[7] See §. 66, 102.

[8] See §. 100.

The spirit of division did not spare the Macedonians any more than the Arians:] τ for there was likewise a division in their party, between Eutropius a Priest who held his congregations apart, and Carterius υ who according to Nicephorus, was the head of this sect. φ Socrates who gives an account of these divisions among the hereticks, says that he speaks only of those which were form'd at several times at Constantinople where he was a witness of them, and not of those which might likewise happen in the other cities. χ Thus these hereticks after having separated from the Church, separated from one another, upon the most trivial pretences, and turn'd against themselves the arms they had taken up [against the truth.

A.D. 388. The resolution which Theodosius took in 388, of marching against Maximus who had made himself master of the West, animating his piety, and making him search after all ways of rendring Jesus Christ favourable to him, [9] he made several laws against the hereticks, in the midst of so much business as was upon his hands by reason of so important a war.] ψ That of the tenth of March forbids them all in general, and the Apollinarians in particular, to perform any

[9] See Theodosius, I. §. 41.

ο Socr. p. 292. b. π b. | Soz. p. 731. a. ρ Socr. p. 292. b. | Soz. p. 730. d. σ Thdrt. hær. l. 4. c. 4. p. 238. b,c. τ Socr. l. 5. c. 24. p. 293. b. υ Nphr. l. 12. c. 30. p. 382. e. φ Socr. p. 293. b. χ c. 20. p. 279, 280. ψ Cod. Th. 16. t. 5. l. 14. p. 130.

ordi-

ordination, to hold any congregation, either in churches or private houſes, or even to live in the towns. It will not ſo much as allow them to come to ask any favour of him. ω That of the 14th of June orders, that officers ſhall be fixt to take up thoſe who ſhall be preſent at aſſemblies which had been ſo often prohibited. α He made another two days after, to forbid diſputing in publick upon religion. β The Arians pretended to have obtain'd a reſcript from him that was favourable to them; but he diſowns this reſcript in the law of the eighth of Auguſt, wherein he orders that all who ſhall produce any thing like it, ſhall be puniſh'd as guilty of forgery. γ It is thought that theſe laws, particularly the firſt, might be the conſequence of the exhortations which S. Gregory had given Nectarius, to get him to oppoſe the liberty which the hereticks gave themſelves. A.D. 388.

δ While Theodoſius was conquering Maximus, [10] the report ran at Conſtantinople that he was overcome. The Arians receiv'd this news with joy, and improv'd it: and as if the defeat of Theodoſius had allow'd them to do any thing, they roſe in arms, fir'd Nectarius's houſe, ε and perhaps likewiſe the great Church of S. Sophia. ζ This action deſerv'd to be ſeverely puniſh'd; but Arcadius obtain'd their pardon. [10] See ibid. §. 48.

[We may here finiſh the hiſtory of the Arians under Theodoſius, not meeting with any thing more that relates to them, except the laws which this Prince continued to make againſt them; but which are mention'd in his hiſtory, and may be found almoſt all together in the Theodoſian Code under the title of Hereticks.] η That of the 15th of June 392, which lays a fine of ten pounds of gold upon all who take, give, or receive the title of Clerks among the hereticks, [is the moſt remarkable of them.]

ω l. 15. p. 131. α t. 4. l. 2. p. 100. β t. 5. l. 16. p. 132. γ n. p. 130. δ Socr. l. 5. c. 13. p. 272. | Soz. l. 7. c. 14. p. 722. d. ε Codi. ori. C. p. 64. b. ζ Amb. ep. 17. p. 213. d. η Cod. Th. 16. t. 5. l. 11. p. 138.

NOTES

NOTES

Upon the

HISTORY

OF THE

ARIANS.

NOTE I. referr'd to in §. 2. p. 5.

That the beginning of Arianiſm may be plac'd about the year 319.

IT is not eaſy to find in hiſtory the exact time when Arius began to publiſh his hereſy. There will be little difficulty in it, if with S. Jerom we place the beginning of S. Alexander's epiſcopate in 321. For from this time to that of the Council of Nice, there is juſt time ſufficient for every thing that paſs'd upon the affair of Arianiſm to be done in: ſo that we might place the beginning of Arianiſm in 321 or 322. There is one thing that favours this opinion, and that is, that all the authors who treat upon this hereſy, do not ſpeak of it till after the defeat of Licinius in 323, and

and ſo they ſeem to have believ'd, that theſe two things happen'd pretty near upon the ſame time. But as we believe we have ſhew'd [1] that it is better to make S. Alexander's epiſcopate begin from the year 312, that cannot hinder us from making Arianiſm commence before 321, if there are reaſons for us to do ſo.

[1] See S. Alexander, Note 1.

That which appears the moſt certain in this matter,] θ is what Euſebius ſays, and Rufinus after him, that this affair began to trouble the Church, when it enjoy'd on all ſides a profound peace, and had no foreign enemy to fear. ι We find likewiſe that S. Alexander in his letter to the Biſhop of Byzantium, written a little after the beginning of theſe troubles, κ ſays that Arius and his followers us'd their utmoſt endeavours to raiſe a perſecution againſt him during the peace of the Church. [It ſeems to me therefore that it muſt be agreed on all hands, that Arianiſm began to ſhew itſelf either before or after the perſecution of Licinius, that is either before the year 320, about which time the perſecution began, or after the month of September 323, when Conſtantine defeated Licinius, and became maſter of the Eaſtern empire.]

λ If we regard the order in which the hiſtorians have related the facts, and alſo their general way of expreſſing themſelves, we muſt not place the beginning of Arianiſm till after the overthrow of Licinius, [two years and a half or a little more before the Council of Nice. But we do not ſee how it is poſſible to allow no more time for every thing that was done in this affair, till it was brought before the Council. No doubt it had made a great noiſe in the world when Conſtantine wrote his letter to Alexander and Arius, and that was at the lateſt [2] in February 324. It is more reaſonable to think that theſe authors not being willing to break the thread of their ſtory, join'd what went before the perſecution of Licinius with what follow'd it, and made much more noiſe in the world. Beſides, they ſeem to have intended to point out two diſtinct times in which theſe things were tranſacted; one when the Church was perſecuted by the Pagans, the other when it was free from any outward violence, yet was from within diſturb'd with Arianiſm. Now the firſt of theſe times not being concluded till 323, by the defeat of Licinius, when the Church began to be in full peace, they did not think themſelves oblig'd to take notice, that Arianiſm which belong'd to the laſt of theſe terms, had already begun in the firſt.

[2] See S. Alexander, Note 6.

What may ſeem to be a ſtrong proof for not placing the beginning of this hereſy till 323 or 324, is that S. Athanaſius joins it with the time of the Council of Nice, as if it were the ſame thing.] "μ It is now a long time, ſays he, ſince the malice of "the Melitians and the impiety of the Arians has been known "in the world; for theſe are no Novelties. It is now fifty five

θ *Euſ. v. Conſ. l.* 2. *c.* 61. *p.* 471. *d.* | *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *p.* 158. ι *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 3. *p.* 525. *c.* κ *p.* 536. *a.* λ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 4, 5. *p.* 8, 9. | *Soz. l.* 1. *c.* 15. *p.* 425. *d.* | *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *p.* 522, 523. μ *Ath. or.* 1. *p.* 305. a, b.

"years

"years since the first became schismaticks, and thirty six since "the others were denounc'd hereticks, and cast out of the Church "by the sentence of an OEcumenical Council."

[But I do not know whether this very passage may not exactly fix the time of Arius's heresy. For the piece in which S. Athanasius says this, was written in the beginning of the year 356, as may be seen in another place, only 31 years after the Council of Nice. So that either there is a mistake in the number 36, which yet the Benedictins have not discover'd in any of their manuscripts, or else the meaning of this passage is, that the Arians had been declar'd hereticks 36 years before by S. Alexander, and that they were likewise excommunicated afterwards by the Council of Nice. The Greek will bear this interpretation, which removes some considerable difficulties.] ν I apprehend Father Pagi understood the place in this sense, tho' he has not express'd himself very clearly in the point: ξ And he even seems to think sometimes, that the OEcumenical Council in this place means the general Council of Egypt which condemn'd Arius; [which indeed would take away the difficulty more perfectly, but to say no more of it, has very little probability in it. But if the sense which we follow is the true one, the Council of Egypt must be plac'd in 320, after which properly the Arians must have pass'd for condemn'd hereticks, or at the soonest in 319, which cannot be said to differ from S. Athanasius, and allows us to place the beginning of the persecution of Licinius in the year 320, as S. Jerom has done. We might however place the condemnation of Arius at the beginning, and the persecution at the end of the year 320. The sequel of Arius's story might go on during the persecution, which was not extremely violent,] ο and the law by which Licinius endeavour'd to destroy the Church by hindering the meeting of Councils, [might not be promulg'd till 322 and 323, or might not be regarded by the Bishops.

This is what appears to us to be the most probable opinion, till other people clear this difficulty in a better manner. And by this it is not hard to apprehend the reason,] π why Constantine never heard any thing of Arianism till after he had subdu'd Licinius. [For this affair having begun to break out in 319 or 320, was immediately stifled by the noise of the persecution; and the same correspondence which was held at that time between Constantine and Licinius, made the people in the West know less of what was doing in the Eastern parts of the world. The letter which S. Alexander wrote concerning this matter to S. Silvester, perhaps did not reach farther; and Constantine who was more in Illyricum than at Rome, might possibly never have seen it.]

ρ Baronius has follow'd another opinion, and pretends that Arianism began at the latest in the year 315. σ But at the same time he agrees, that all the noise about this heresy, that is, eve-

ν *Pagi*, 315. §. 5. ξ §. 7. ο *Euſ. v. Conſ. l.* 1. *c.* 51. *p.* 434. π *l.* 2. *c.* 66, 68. *p.* 473, 474. ρ *Bar.* 315. §. 19, 23. σ §. 23. | 318. §. 42, 45.

ry thing that happen'd after Arius's journey into Paleſtine, and after Euſebius had taken him into his protection, did not fall out till ſome years after. [Theodorit is pretty favourable to this opinion,] τ for he makes the Arian hereſy take its riſe from the jealouſy Arius had conceiv'd upon ſeeing S. Alexander rais'd to the epiſcopate. [So that by this it ſeems we cannot make the effect follow too near upon its cauſe: But I do not think this is contrary to what we have ſaid;] υ it being eaſy to imagine that the affair of Arius was heard of a pretty while, and even ſome years, before it was brought before the Council of Egypt: [So that I do not think it any great inconvenience] Φ to agree with Father Pagi, that the hereſy of Arius did ſhew itſelf when S. Alexander was firſt made Biſhop, tho' it was not condemn'd by the Council of Alexandria till 321 [or 320. Nevertheleſs it is notorious, that theſe jealouſies are breeding ſometimes a great while in the heart before they break out, eſpecially in men of a cloſe and ſullen temper, as Arius is deſcrib'd to be.

Indeed Baronius does not alledge this reaſon.] χ But he lays the greateſt ſtreſs upon this, that Lactantius, who according to him wrote in the year 315, places the Arians in the number of hereticks. [But we think we have ſhewn [3] in another place,] ψ that it is by no means certain that Lactantius wrote in 315, [that he might either compoſe or augment his work about the year 322, and that whatever was the time when he wrote, there is no likelihood that he ever ſaid a word of the Arians. They could not have been unknown to Conſtantine in 323, either if they began to trouble the Church in the year 315, or if they were known to Lactantius whether in 315 or 322, ſince his work was addreſs'd to Conſtantine, who had plac'd his ſon Criſpus under his care.]

[3] See Lactantius, Note 4.

ω Baronius alledges likewiſe Oroſius, who ſpeaks of Arius immediately after a creation of Cæſars, which happen'd according to Baronius in 315, [and which [4] others place in 317. But he might have conſider'd that Oroſius did not write annals, but only an abridgment of hiſtory, in which he hardly makes any other diſtinction of facts than by the reigns of the Emperors. And not to go any farther,] α he places this ſame creation of Cæſars which precedes what he ſays of Arianiſm, after the defeat and death of Licinius, [tho' it is very certain, this creation was made many years before.

[4] See Conſtantine, Note 40.

We may ſpend more conſideration upon S. Baſileus,] β whom Baronius alledges likewiſe, tho' we do not lay any great weight upon what he ſays out of his acts, [which indeed do not deſerve much credit. We only regard the authority of S. Athanaſius,] γ who places this Saint among thoſe whoſe faith was not to be doubted of in the point of the divinity of the Son, [which ſeems to be a good preſumption to ſay that he had ſeen the beginning of Arianiſm, and had declar'd againſt it. And S. Jerom aſſures

τ *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *p.* 523. *c.* υ *Ath. vit. p.* 2. *a, f.* | 3. 2. *c.* Φ *Pagi*, 315. §. 5. χ *Bar.* 315. §. 20. ψ *Pagi*, 315. §. 6. ω *Bar.* 316. §. 20. α *Oroſ. l.* 7. *c.* 28. *p.* 217. 2. *b, c.* β *Bar.* 315. §. 22. γ *Ath. or.* 1. *p.* 291. *c.*

us

us in his chronicle, that he died a martyr in 320. For tho' ſome pretend he did not die till after the Council of Nice, yet their reaſons do not ſeem to us to be ſtrong enough, to make us reject the teſtimony of S. Jerom [5].] δ But ſuppoſing, as we do, that Arianiſm broke out before the death of this Saint, and before the perſecution of Licinius; all that is ſaid upon this point proves nothing againſt us. [It would be ſtronger againſt thoſe who would not have Arianiſm begin till the end of 323, if there were any perſons who maintain'd that opinion: And yet they might anſwer, that tho' S. Baſileus died before the birth of Arianiſm, he might declare his faith in this article other ways, and perhaps by oppoſing Euſebius of Nicomedia, who appear'd an Arian long before Arius himſelf did. ; See S. Baſileus.

The ſucceſſion alſo of the Biſhops of Antioch may make ſome believe, that Arianiſm began before the year 321. For it is certain it had blaz'd out very much during the life of S. Philogonius: And S. Jerom's chronicle informs us, that between him and S. Euſtathius who in 325 aſſiſted at the Council of Nice, Paulinus govern'd the Church of Antioch. But he was Biſhop there only one year, till the beginning of the year 325 [6].] [6] See S. Euſtathius.

ε Father Pagi thinks that this opinion which we follow as well as he, may be confirm'd by the chronicle of S. Proſper, who places, ſays he, the condemnation of Arius in the year 321. [It places it rather in the year 322. But as it joins the hereſy of Arius and the Council of Nice together, no great ſtreſs can be laid upon it.] ζ The ſame Father places with Valeſius, two Councils at Alexandria againſt Arius, that he may put the epiſtle to S. Alexander of Conſtantinople, before that which is addreſs'd to all the Biſhops. [We think we have given a ſufficient anſwer to all this in the 6th Note upon S. Alexander of Alexandria.]

NOTE II. referr'd to in §. 5. p. 16.

Upon Theodotus of Laodicea.

η ARius when he reckons up the Biſhops that were of the ſame ſentiments with him, names two, [to whom Euſebius gives great commendations,] Paulinus of Tyre and Theodotus of Laodicea. [We ſhall ſpeak of the firſt in another place.] θ As to Theodotus, Euſebius ſays that he rais'd up the Church of Laodicea, which ſeem'd ſunk to nothing thro' the cowardly behaviour of Stephen his predeceſſor, [who in all likelihood had renounc'd the faith:] that he ſhew'd by his actions he was the gift of God, as his name imports, and a true Biſhop; that he was an excellent phyſician for the body, but no one came up to him for ſpiritual phyſick and curing the diſeaſes of the ſoul; that he excell'd in ſweetneſs of temper, ſincerity, compaſſion for the

δ *Pagi*, 315. §. 6. ε §. 5. ζ §. 7. η *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 4. *p.* 537. *b.* | 538. *a.* θ *Euſ. l.* 7. *c.* 32. *p.* 288. *b, c.*

afflicted, and charity to all those that stood in need of his assistance; and that besides all these good qualities, he had a profound knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

ι It is no doubt upon the account of these high encomiums, that Usuardus and Ado have plac'd Theodotus in the number of Saints in their martyrologies on the twelfth of November, in which they are follow'd by others. κ Baronius has no way of defending his right to be a Saint but from this passage in Eusebius, from Nicephorus who copies it, from Usuardus, and from Ado who makes use of the very words of Eusebius.

[The testimony of Arius would not be a sufficient proof against Theodotus.] λ But Theodorit speaking of those who defended Arius, and oppos'd the Catholick doctrine in the Council of Nice, the first he mentions are those whom he says he had nam'd before after Arius, [not excepting Paulinus and Theodotus, who were of the Patriarchate of Antioch, as he himself was: So that he was particularly concern'd to vindicate them, if they were innocent, and still more so if they were honour'd as Saints in their Churches.] μ In another place where he reckons up those, who had principally embrac'd and entertain'd the impiety which Arius had first sown, he sets down these two Prelates by name. ν He places Theodotus likewise among those who had suck'd in the poison of Arius, who were of the same principles with the two Eusebius's, and who for that reason came to Antioch in 331 to depose S. Eustathius. ξ It is plain from the letter that Constantine wrote to this very Theodotus after the Council of Nice, upon the banishment of Eusebius and Theognis, that he was thought an accomplice in the impiety of those two Chiefs of Arianism. [And what is more considerable than all the rest,] ο S. Athanasius places Paulinus and Theodotus among them who had written impieties pretty near the same with Arius's before the Council of Nice. π The Synodicon names Theodotus and George among the Chiefs of Arianism, who he says were condemn'd by the second General Council. [It is not to be doubted, but they are those of Laodicea.

Therefore tho' Baronius had either put in or left out Theodotus's name in the Roman martyrology,] ρ this did not hinder him from numbring him afterwards among the members of the devil and the chiefs of Arianism, whose treachery is so much the more detestable, because after having sign'd the Nicene Creed, they presently prov'd themselves prevaricators under their own hands, and continu'd followers of Arius.

σ As to the glorious Panegyrick we find of him in Eusebius, besides that it is very suspicious in the mouth of an Arian, we are sensible, that a man may possess the outward appearance of vertue without having the true faith. [Father Vigerius a Jesuit, in his preface to Eusebius's preparation, which is address'd to this

ι *Pagi*, 318. §. 14. κ *Bar.* 2. *nov. h.* λ *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *p.* 542. *b.* μ *l.* 5. *c.* 7. *p.* 712. *a.* ν *l.* 1. *c.* 20. *p.* 568. *c.* ξ *Gel. C. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *p.* 224, 225. ο *Ath. de Syn. p.* 886. *b.* π *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 974. *c.* ρ *Bar.* 325. §. 40. σ *Ath. vie, l.* 1. *c.* 11. *p.* 53.

Theo-

Theodotus, says nothing else of him but that he was a very zealous defender of the Arian impiety. Mr. Fleuri says nothing of him in his Ecclesiastical history, but what will make us of the same opinion.] τ But Father Pagi speaks without reserve, that we ought not to look upon him in another view, and that thro' mistake his name was plac'd in some martyrology.

NOTE III. referr'd to in §. 6. p. 18.

On what side Eusebius of Nicomedia was related to Julian the Apostate.

υ BARONIUS, Blondel, and Valesius pretend that the relation which Julian the Apostate had to Eusebius of Nicomedia, according to Ammianus *l.* 22. *p.* 219. *c.* came by Basilina Julian's mother. Yet they do not tell us the reason of this assertion; and it does not appear that they had any other ground for it than a very weak conjecture, taken from hence, that Φ Basilina was an enemy to S. Eutropius of Adrianople, who had declar'd openly against Eusebius. χ The Benedictins suppose, that he was related to Constantine himself.

NOTE IV. referr'd to in §. 8. p. 27.

That George was a Priest of Arethusa.

ψ THE expression of Constantine, who calls George τὸν Ἀρεθουσίων πρεσβύτερον, [very naturally denotes that he was a Priest of Arethusa. And nothing hinders us from taking it in this sense;] ω for having been depos'd at Alexandria where he was a Priest, [he might very well demand to be receiv'd among the Clergy of Arethusa.] α It sufficiently appears he requir'd to be receiv'd among those of Antioch under S. Eustathius, who refus'd him: but he obtain'd it of his successors.

[There is therefore no necessity,] β that πολίτην should be understood in these words of Constantine, as if he should say that George was a Burgher of Arethusa, as Valesius would have it. γ The whole drift of Constantine's discourse plainly speaks of him in the quality of a Priest, [and not in that of a Burgher. This can serve for no other end but to puzzle the matter,] δ for George was originally of Alexandria according to Philostorgius.

τ *Pagi*, 318. §. 14. υ *Bar.* 337. *n.* 58. | *Blond. p.* 92. | *Amm. n. p.* 299. Φ *Ath. fol. p.* 812. *d.* χ *ut. p.* 7. 1. *c.* ψ *Eus. v. Conf. l.* 1. *c.* 62. *p.* 519. *d.* ω *Ath. fol. p.* 837. *b.* α *p.* 812. *c.* β *Eus. n. p.* 238. 1. *b.* γ *c.* 62. *p.* 519. *d.* δ *Phisg. l.* 8. *c.* 17. *p.* 117.

ε Valeſius ſays, that his being a Burgher does not oblige us to believe he was born at Arethuſa, but only that he liv'd there. [And why did he live there, if he was neither originally of that place, nor a Prieſt there? Or if he ſtay'd there upon the account of his family, how came S. Alexander to make him a Prieſt of Alexandria? In ſhort, this conjecture is very perplexing and intricate; but if we plainly follow what we meet with, every thing is clear in my opinion, and meets with no difficulty.]

NOTE V. referr'd to in §. 9. p. 31.

Conſtantine's letter againſt Arius undoubted, and written about the end of the year 324.

ζ CONſtantine's letter to Arius and the Arians which we meet with in Gelaſius Cyzicenus and Baronius, is plainly that which η S. Epiphanius ſpeaks of; for we find in it every thing cited out of it by that Father, together with the title and the beginning of it which he takes notice of. θ Socrates alſo has given us a very plain hint of it. [And tho' it be a very learned piece, ſo that one might think Hoſius had a hand in it, yet the air of Conſtantine runs thro' the whole. We muſt either therefore acknowledge it is a genuine work of that Prince, or that it is entirely a forgery; which we cannot ſay without unanſwerable reaſons, conſidering the authority it has from the joint teſtimony of S. Epiphanius and Socrates.

It is evident it was written after the deputation of Hoſius and the meeting of the Council of Alexandria, for it condemns Arius in the ſtrongeſt terms,] ι but before the Council of Nice according to the judgment of Baronius, [and as we may conclude from theſe words of Arius, κ *Siquidem in eadem ſententia Epiſcopus Alexandriæ maneat*, which would not have been at all proper, if he had been condemn'd by the General Council. We do not find that this Council's meeting was then thought of, which may be a reaſon for placing this letter before the end of the year 324.] λ Bull ſays, that he is of opinion Conſtantine wrote it about the ſame time that he wrote to thoſe of Nicomedia [after the Council of Nice; but he does not give any particular reaſon for his notion.]

μ The title is, [as S. Epiphanius obſerves,] *To Arius and the Arians:* [And indeed in this writing Conſtantine often applies to Arius himſelf, and refutes a letter which he had written to him.] However the beginning runs in general terms to every body,

ε *Euſ. n. p.* 238. 1. *b, c.* ζ *Gel. C. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *p.* 203 -- 217. | *Bar.* 319. §. 6, 20. η *Epi.* 69. *c.* 9. *p.* 734. *b, c.* θ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 9. *p.* 38. *a.* ι *Bar.* 319 §. 7. κ *Gel. C. p.* 206. *a.* λ *Bull. p.* 387. *a.* μ *Gel. C. p.* 203.

and

υ and he even ſpeaks of Arius in the third perſon. ξ The laſt words, *Deus autem vos cuſtodiat dilectiſſimi*, do not ſeem to relate to the Arians: And the addition, which takes notice that the letter was carried [to Alexandria] by officers that are nam'd there, and read in the palace, ο ſhews that this was not a private letter written particularly to Arius, but a publick one for the whole Empire.

NOTE VI. referr'd to in §. 10. p. 33.

Upon Arius's diſcourſe with Conſtantine.

π WHAT S. Epiphanius ſays of the diſcourſe Arius had with Conſtantine, [is perplex'd with a good many difficulties, as is pretty uſual in his accounts of things. For this converſation agrees very well with what paſs'd in the year 336, a little before the dreadful death of Arius:] ρ And S. Epiphanius by ſpeaking of that accident immediately after this diſcourſe, ſeems indeed as if he would referr it to that time. σ On the other hand, he mentions it as the conſequence of a letter written to Conſtantine by S. Alexander, [who died about ten years before Arius:] τ And he will have this to have preceded Conſtantine's great diſcourſe againſt the Arians, [written in all likelihood in the year 324.]

υ Yet ſince in that writing Conſtantine allows Arius to come to him to give an account of his faith, and even preſſes him to do ſo; [it is very likely Arius did not neglect this opportunity, and that therefore ſomething happen'd upon this occaſion like what S. Epiphanius mentions. But there is no reaſon to believe,] φ that after Conſtantine had receiv'd Arius's confeſſion of his faith, and diſcover'd the fallacies in it, he ſhould immediately deſire him in writing to come to him again to give an account of his doctrine, as it muſt be according to S. Epiphanius. χ And therefore this writing or letter of Conſtantine's is in anſwer to a letter of Arius's, [and not to an oral conference.]

NOTE VII. referr'd to in §. 10. p. 35.

That Euſebius and Theognis were depos'd for having communicated with the Arians.

ψ BAronius thinks that thoſe whom Conſtantine ſent for to Court, and upon whoſe account Euſebius and Theognis

υ *p.* 203, 204. ξ *p.* 217. ο *Bar.* 319. §. 7. π *Epi.* 69. *c.* 9. *p.* 734. ρ *c.* 10. *p.* 734, 735. σ *c.* 9. *p.* 734. *a.* τ *b.* υ *Gel. C. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *p.* 217. *a.* φ *Epi. p.* 734. *b.* χ *Gel. C. p.* 205. *c.* | 209. *c.* ψ *Bar.* 329. §. 12.

were depos'd, were the Melitians of whom S. Epiphanius ſpeaks *hær.* 68. *c.* 5. *p.* 720, 721. ω But Conſtantine ſays they were ſuch as had forſaken the true faith, [which could not be ſaid of the Melitians at that time.] α And ſince the Council of Alexandria declares, that Euſebius and Theognis were depos'd as well for their impiety, as for having communicated with the Arians, condemn'd by the Council of Nice, β this will not allow us to enquire after any other explanation. γ For in reality it was for the reaſons we mention'd, that they were baniſh'd.

NOTE VIII. referr'd to in §. 11. p. 37.

Stories relating to the baniſhment of Euſebius and Theognis.

δ WE cannot doubt but the reaſon why Euſebius and Theognis were baniſh'd, was their open hereſy, as Theodorit and Philoſtorgius inform us; ε as alſo the communion they maintain'd with the Arians. [Later authors relate other circumſtances more particular indeed, but not ſo certain.] ζ Sozomen ſays, Euſebius and Theognis having gain'd him who by the Emperor's order kept the Acts of the Council, eras'd their own names, and then had the aſſurance to preach openly, that the Son was not conſubſtantial with the Father. He adds, that Conſtantine having reprimanded Euſebius for it, he had the impudence to tell him, that if in his ſight any body ſhould cut his coat into two pieces, he would never ſay theſe two pieces were of one and the ſame eſſence; which enrag'd the Emperor ſo much the more, becauſe by this he ſaw the Council had not put an end to theſe debates, as he thought. η Sozomen tells this as a greater certainty, than what is really founded on the authority of Conſtantine himſelf. θ And yet in another place, he rejects it as a thing that appear'd to be only a fiction of the Arians very different from the truth.

ι Philoſtorgius tells the ſtory after another manner, [that has ſtill leſs probability,] namely that Euſebius and Theognis repenting of having ſet their hands, came to Conſtantine to tell him they acknowledg'd themſelves to blame in ſubſcribing to impiety out of fear of his threats. He ſays that Maris of Chalcedon did the ſame thing; κ and that the Emperor being angry that they had play'd the hypocrite in ſubſcribing, λ baniſh'd them forthwith into Gaul, ſent away all the other Arians [who had

ω *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 19. *p.* 567. *b.* α *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 727. *c.* β *Socr.* 1. *p.* 110. 2. *a, b.* γ *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 19. *p.* 567. *c.* δ *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 18. *p.* 565. *d.* | *Phiſg. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *p.* 8. ε *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 727. *c.* ζ *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 21. *p.* 472. *c, d.* η *d.* | 473. *a.* θ *l.* 3. *c.* 19. *p.* 530, 531. ι *Phiſg. ap. p.* 177, 178. κ *l.* 2. *c.* 1. *p.* 8. λ *ap. p.* 178.

ſub-

ſubſcrib'd,] μ and on the other hand recall'd Secundus, and thoſe who had been baniſh'd with him into Illyricum, ν among whom was Arius.

[This behaviour is a little too ridiculous to be believ'd by any body, and yet Philoſtorgius goes farther,] ξ and ſays that Conſtantine wrote letters to all quarters condemning the Conſubſtantiality, and eſtabliſhing the doctrine of the Son's being of another Subſtance from the Father; that S. Alexander ſubſcrib'd theſe letters; ο and that then Arius communicated with him; but that the fear of Conſtantine which Alexander had then upon him being gone off, he return'd to his former ſentiments; and that then Arius and his followers ſeparated both from him and from the Church. π Things ſo abſurd in themſelves, ρ and which come from the pen of an infamous Arian, and one that delights in telling lies, (for this is the title Photius beſtows upon him at the beginning of this Section,) [might be refuted eaſily, if it were worth while.] σ Some of theſe ſtories, tho' told after a different way, are to be met with in Sozomen, who ridicules them.

NOTE IX. referr'd to in §. 12. p. 40.

At what time Arius was recall'd.

τSOcrates and Sozomen thought, that Arius and his diſciples after being baniſh'd at the time of the Council of Nice, were preſently recall'd, and had liberty to go where they pleas'd, except to the city of Alexandria. But it does not appear they had any other foundation for their opinion but the pretended petition of Euſebius and Theognis: [and we think we ſhall ſhew in Note 8. on the Council of Nice, that this piece is too ſuſpicious to found any thing upon.] υ Philoſtorgius likewiſe places the recalling of Arius but a little after the Council of Nice. [But he joins this with ſo many inſufferable Fables, that there is no reſting upon his teſtimony.

There remains no body to be examin'd now but Rufinus, who differs from Socrates and Sozomen in this, that he does not make two baniſhments of Arius. He alſo differs both from them and Philoſtorgius,] φ in that he does not place the recalling of Arius till after the death of Conſtantia, who ſurviv'd Helen; χ and Helen could not be dead till after the year 326, [or rather [1] in 328]. ψ He ſeems even to put back the recalling of Arius till

[1] See S. Helen, §. 7.

μ *l.* 2. *c.* 1. *p.* 8. ν *ap. p.* 177. ξ *l.* 2. c. 1. *p.* 8. ο p. 9. π *Ath. vit. p.* 11. 2. ρ *Phiſg. p.* 8. σ *Soz. l.* 3. *c.* 19. *p.* 530, 531. τ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 14. *p.* 44. *c*, *d.* | *Soz. l.* 1. *c.* 16. *p.* 464. *b.* υ *Phiſg. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *p.* 8, 9. φ *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *p.* 166, 167. χ *Bar.* 326. §. 59. ψ *Ruf. p.* 167. 1.

towards

towards the time of the Council of Jeruſalem, [which was held in 335, which we would readily conſent to, if we thought this could agree with ſo many perſecutions as S. Athanaſius underwent before the year 335, becauſe he would not yield to the requeſt of Euſebius, nor the expreſs command of Conſtantine, who order'd him to receive Arius into the Church. For it cannot be ſuppos'd Conſtantine who gave ſuch an order, would at the ſame time leave Arius in baniſhment, which he ſuffer'd only upon the account of his hereſy. And tho' it ſhould be ſaid, that this baniſhment was nothing, but that he was not to go to Alexandria, S. Athanaſius could not according to the ordinary rule receive him to the communion, unleſs he was preſent to deſire and receive it;] ω and Socrates indeed aſſures us, that he came to Alexandria for that very purpoſe.

[We muſt therefore leave Rufinus in this laſt point; but there is not the ſame neceſſity to leave him in the other: on the contrary his opinion conſider'd in itſelf appears highly probable. For Conſtantine could not recall Arius from exile, but upon a ſuppoſition that he had renounc'd his hereſy and embrac'd the Catholick faith, and Conſtantine under this perſuaſion could not but demand he ſhould be receiv'd to communion, as it is certain he did. It is likewiſe plain thro' all hiſtory, that as Arius was a Prieſt of Alexandria, and was at firſt condemn'd by this Church, it was believ'd requiſite he ſhould be received again to communion, by the abſolution and conſent of the ſame Church. This is what the Euſebians drove at with all their zeal;] α this is what they got Conſtantine to demand; this was the ground of all the perſecutions againſt S. Athanaſius, who bravely refus'd to receive this Arch-heretick: β and when after the depoſition of this Saint he was receiv'd by the Council of Jeruſalem, [whoſe authority might be eſteem'd ſuperior to that of the Church of Alexandria;] yet this Council ſent him to Alexandria, and wrote to that Church to receive him. [There is then all the reaſon in the world to believe he was not recall'd, till they had a mind to ſend him to Alexandria,] γ which Euſebius, according to Socrates, us'd all his endeavours to bring about immediately after the depoſition of S. Euſtathius, [that is in the year 331; and that therefore his being recall'd muſt be plac'd in the ſame year, or at ſooneſt at the end of 330, and what Socrates ſays of his Re-eſtabliſhment at Alexandria muſt relate to his being recall'd.

What obliges us to ſay, that his being recall'd muſt be plac'd at the end of 330,] δ is the letter which Conſtantine wrote to him, recorded in Socrates, which is dated upon the 27th of November. [For if we ſuppoſe this to be written in 331, we cannot make the perſecution againſt S. Athanaſius begin till 332, and we do not ſee that this will allow us time enough for thoſe various turns which it took before the Council of Cæſarea in 334. But by placing this letter in 330, we can ſay that in the

ω *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 27. *p.* 62. α *Ath. ap. p.* 2. *p.* 778. β *ſol. p.* 890, 891. γ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 24. *p.* 60. a, b. δ *c.* 25. *p.* 61. *b.*

begin-

beginning of 331,] ε Euſebius wrote to S. Athanaſius to get him to receive Arius: upon his refuſal he got Conſtantine to write; but this having no more effect, he ſent to the Melitians to make a ſtir; the Melitians were ſome time inventing a calumny; and at laſt they accus'd the Saint of demanding linnen robes: [and this it may be is properly the beginning of his perſecution,] ζ which Socrates ſays follow'd ſoon after the depoſition of S. Euſtathius, [which happen'd in 331.

It may be doubted whether the letter of the 27th of November relates to the recalling of Arius; for it does not ſpeak expreſly of it; but we do not ſee at what time elſe it can be plac'd. It cannot however relate] η to the order which Conſtantine ſent him to come to Court [in 336.] For he came then from Alexandria: θ and Conſtantine in his letter promiſes to ſend him thither again. ι He was even diſſatisfied with him in 336, [and he ſeems pleas'd with him in his letter. The 27th of November may relate to the time when Arius was receiv'd to communion by the Council of Jeruſalem at the end of the year 335.] κ But according to hiſtory, he went then from Jeruſalem to Alexandria, without returning to Court. [It is therefore beſt to follow the order of Socrates, and place this letter before Conſtantine ſent Arius to Alexandria to be admitted there to communion by S. Athanaſius. He expreſſes in it a great deal of friendſhip for a man who was baniſh'd as an heretick and a ſeditious perſon, and who was really ſent for to purge himſelf of his crimes. But we muſt believe that Euſebius had already clear'd him to Conſtantine's ſatisfaction.

We cannot help taking notice here of a blunder in Socrates, which one could hardly believe if one did not ſee it with one's own eyes.] λ For becauſe Conſtantine's letter declares that Arius had already receiv'd orders to come to Court; he ſays it appears from hence that Conſtantine had often exhorted him to repentance, and that he reproves him for not returning to the truth with all expedition after what he had ſeveral times written to him. [I wiſh for Socrates's honour, we could ſay he was not the author of this paſſage.]

NOTE X. referr'd to in §. 13. p. 41.

That there is no reaſon to reject what Ruſinus ſays of the Prieſt that deceiv'd Conſtantine.

μ VAleſius ſuſpects all that Rufinus ſays of this Prieſt who was recommended to Conſtantine by his ſiſter, and was the cauſe of Arius's being recall'd. [We have not much more regard to Rufinus in matters of hiſtory than he has: But yet we

ε *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 778. ζ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 24. *p.* 60. *a*, *b*. η *c.* 37. *p.* 73. *a*. θ *c.* 25. *p.* 61. *b*. ι *c.* 37. *p.* 73. *a*. κ *p.* 72. *d*. λ *c.* 25. *p.* 61. *c*. μ *Socr. n. p.* 142. *d*.

do

do not see why we should reject a thing that has nothing improbable in it, and which no body contradicts. Rufinus does not name the Priest. But how many omissions of this kind are there in history, for which we cannot give a reason? S. Athanasius says nothing of it; but S. Athanasius did not write an history. He speaks of things which relate to his subject, and passes by an infinite number of others. Arius was certainly recall'd from banishment, and S. Athanasius does not say how. Rufinus is the only person who tells us of it; his relation has nothing in it unreasonable, it has been embrac'd by all the historians and by Theodorit himself. It is carrying exactness to too great a height to refuse receiving these kind of facts, not as of infallible authority, but like most things we read and hear of, which we believe and receive as truth as long as we meet with nothing to the contrary.]

NOTE XI. referr'd to in §. 14. p. 45.

That Asclepas was depos'd in the year 331.

[WE place the deposition of Asclepas of Gaza in 331,] [v] because it happen'd seventeen years before the Council of Sardica, [which was held in 347; and therefore this must be in 330 or 331. It is also probable he was depos'd by the Council of Antioch, and particularly by Eusebius of Cæsarea, who was there. For this is likely enough the sense of the words of the Council of Sardica,] [ξ] which Baronius explains quite otherwise, not having consulted the Greek; [o] that he had produc'd Acts made at Antioch in the presence of his accusers and Eusebius of Cæsarea, and had prov'd his innocence by the sentence of those who had sat as judges upon him. [He was then in all likelihood depos'd by the same Council of Antioch, in which Eusebius of Cæsarea depos'd S. Eustathius in the year 331.

I do not know why] [π] Baronius says he was of the Arian faction before the Council of Nice. [I meet with nothing to induce one to believe it.]

[ρ] Sozomen says he was depos'd because some hereticks objected against him that he had pull'd down an Altar; [σ] but the Eusebians did not accuse him of this crime till after his deposition and return [which happen'd in the year 338.]

v *Bar.* 347. §. 91.
π *Bar.* 347. §. 39. 347. §. 89.
ξ §. 39.
o *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 764. *d.*
ρ *Soz. l.* 3. *c.* 8. *p.* 507. *b.*
σ *Bar.*

NOTE

NOTE XII. referr'd to in §. 15. p. 49.

Upon the Biſhops who were put into S. Euſtathius's place at Antioch by the Euſebians.

τSOcrates and Sozomen place no Biſhops at Antioch between S. Euſtathius and Euphronius; [but S. Jerom in his Chronicle,] υ and Theodorit put Eulalius before Euphronius, [in which they are follow'd by Nicephorus's Chronicle, by Theophanes *p.* 23. *d*, and by Eutychius *p.* 455, who calls him Valerius.] φ Eulalius is likewiſe mention'd by Philoſtorgius. [We have obſerv'd in the text, and you may ſee in Note I. upon S. Euſtathius, the reaſons which oblige us to put Paulinus of Tyre before Eulalius.

We do not keep to the years which the chronologers have allow'd theſe Biſhops,] χ nor to what Socrates ſays, that the ſee was vacant eight years before the election of Euphronius. [All this would carry us a good way beyond 335, in which year it is certain Placcillus, Euphronius's ſucceſſor, aſſiſted at the Council of Tyre.]

NOTE XIII. referr'd to in §. 16. p. 49.

That poſſibly there was ſome diſturbance there at the nomination of Euſebius for Antioch.

[AS Socrates and Sozomen do not place any Biſhop between S. Euſtathius and Euphronius, who was elected upon the refuſal of Euſebius of Cæſarea, they make the troubles which happen'd according to him upon S. Euſtathius's account, to relate to the nomination of Euſebius; and Euſebius who has not given us a detail of theſe matters, occaſions this confuſion. And yet he diſtinguiſhes accurately enough his nomination from the troubles that preceded it.] ψ For he ſays he will not give us Conſtantine's letter about the diſturbances, but only ſuch as regard him, which this Prince wrote after having been appriz'd of the agreeable news of the re-union and peace.

[This does not hinder but that there might be ſome diſturbance at the nomination of Euſebius, it being eaſy to believe what Socrates ſays,] ω that theſe troubles were often renew'd

τ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 24. *p.* 60. *a.* | *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 19. *p.* 470. *a.* υ *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 21. *p.* 569. *c.* φ *Phiſg. l.* 3. *c.* 15. *p.* 49. χ *Socr. p.* 60. *a.* ψ *Euſ. v. Conſ. l.* 3. *c.* 59. *p.* 515. *d.* ω *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 24. *p.* 59. *c.*

when

when a new Biſhop was to be elected. α And indeed Conſtantine ſays that Euſebius when he was nominated, came to Antioch to give wholſome advice. β Euſebius himſelf ſays, that the people of Antioch had made peace either *by his means*, as Valeſius tranſlates it, [which may relate to the depoſition of S. Euſtathius, or *in him*, that is in agreeing to nominate him; which gives us an intimation of a new diſturbance; and the Greek, ἐφ' ᾧ is moſt favourable to this ſenſe.]

NOTE XIV. referr'd to in §. 17. p. 53.

The relation of Sozomen concerning the ordination of S. Maximus of Jeruſalem, very ſuſpicious.

[SOzomen relates a very conſiderable circumſtance of the election of S. Maximus of Jeruſalem.] γ For he tells us, that S. Macarius his predeceſſor having ordain'd him Biſhop of Dioſpolis, the people of Jeruſalem who reverenc'd him for his being a Confeſſor and for the holineſs of his life, and who upon this account deſign'd him one time or other for their Biſhop, murmur'd very much at this election, and broke out almoſt into a mutiny, which oblig'd S. Macarius to keep him with him, and place another Biſhop in the Church of Dioſpolis. And even thoſe who know moſt of the matter, adds Sozomen, aſſure us, that having repented he had ordain'd S. Maximus to this ſee, he underhand rais'd an inſurrection among the people, that he might have an excuſe for keeping him with him; believing that ſuch a man as he was, firm to the faith, and belov'd by the people, was neceſſary to preſerve his Church in peace after his death, and hinder Euſebius and Patrophilus who had a mind to diſturb it, from putting in a man of their faction for his ſucceſſor.

[This account has a good deal of difficulty in it, for it is not likely S. Macarius ordain'd Biſhops in Paleſtine, conſidering the Canon the Council of Nice had juſt made, which leaves all the rights of a metropolitan entirely to the Biſhop of Cæſarea. And tho' he had ſeparated from Euſebius who was Biſhop of Cæſarea at that time, as Sozomen immediately after, *p.* 471. *b*, ſays he did, he could not encroach upon his rights without very much offending Conſtantine, who was almoſt equally a friend to the Niçene Canons, the peace of the Church, and Euſebius.

Beſides, it is hard to ſuppoſe the ſee of Dioſpolis or Lydda was then vacant,] δ becauſe Aëtius, who was Biſhop there before the Council of Nice, ε was alive at the time of the depoſition of

α *Euſ.* c. 60. *p.* 517. *d.* β *c.* 59. *p.* 516. *a.* γ *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 20. *p.* 470, 471. δ *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 20. *p.* 568. *c.* ε *Euſ. v. Conſ. l.* 3. *c.* 62. *p.* 519. *b.*

S. Eu-

S. Euſtathius, and the intruſion of Euphronius [which cannot be plac'd according to what we have ſaid, before the year 332. And it is even probable that he liv'd till 349, as we ſhall ſee when we come to this year in the hiſtory of Athanaſius.]

NOTE XV. referr'd to in §. 17. p. 54.

Whether S. Maximus conſented to the depoſition of S. Athanaſius.

ζ SOzomen ſays it was a common report, that S. Maximus had through ſurprize conſented to the depoſition of S. Athanaſius. η Socrates ſpeaks of it more poſitively. θ S. Athanaſius himſelf ſays, that the Biſhops of the Council of Jeruſalem, who receiv'd him in 349, and of whom S. Maximus was the Chief, made their excuſe to him for what they had written before, proteſting that what they did was thro' force and not according to their inclinations. [But it is not neceſſary this ſhould be true of every one of them in particular. So that I do not know whether we have ſufficient reaſon to preferr the authority of Socrates to that of Rufinus,] ι who aſſures us that S. Maximus was always in communion with S. Athanaſius.

κ Baronius maintains directly that Socrates is miſtaken in this point, and for this he alledges that S. Maximus aſſiſted at the Council of Sardica, as may be ſeen, ſays he, by the ſubſcription preſerv'd in λ S. Athanaſius. μ But as S. Athanaſius himſelf declares, that part of theſe ſubſcriptions were made after the Council, [it is plain, there can be nothing at all concluded from thence. On the contrary,] ν Valeſius ſuppoſes that S. Maximus really ſign'd the condemnation of S. Athanaſius in the Council of Tyre, which he makes uſe of, to render what Rufinus ſays ſuſpicious, that S. Paphnutius made him go out of the aſſembly at Tyre, and declare for S. Athanaſius; [tho' after he had declar'd for him, he might ſign his condemnation through weakneſs, either at Tyre or at Jeruſalem.] ξ Valeſius believes likewiſe, that it is becauſe of the falſe ſtep that S. Paul of Conſtantinople and S. Maximus made in ſigning at Tyre, (for the Arians report it of the former,) that S. Athanaſius does not mention them, ο when he reckons up the Prelates of his time whoſe faith could not be ſuſpected.

ζ *Soz. l.* 3. *c.* 6. *p.* 504. *c, d.* η *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 8. *p.* 84. *d.* θ *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 775. *c.* | *ſol. p.* 825. *b, c.* ι *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 17. *p.* 170. 1. κ *Bar.* 350. §. 14. λ *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 768. *c.* μ *b. p.* 767. *a.* ν *Socr. n. p.* 112. 1. *d.* ξ *p.* 188. ο *Ath. or.* 1. *p.* 291. *b, c.*

NOTE

NOTE XVI. referr'd to in §. 21. p. 62.

That Arius himself was receiv'd to communion by the Council of Jerusalem.

π VAlesius pretends, that it was not Arius who was receiv'd in the year 335 in the Council of Jerusalem, but only his followers; because in this Council's epistle, and in most of the passages of S. Athanasius, there is only τὸν περὶ Ἄρειον, [terms which generally signify Arius alone, or Arius and the Arians, but which may likewise mean the Arians without Arius; tho' this sense is pretty rare.] ρ What obliges Valesius to maintain this, is that being certain that Arius died whilst S. Alexander was Bishop of Constantinople, he pretends that S. Paul succeeded S. Alexander before the Council of Tyre, which preceded that of Jerusalem. [But we hope to shew in its proper place,] σ that his arguments for placing S. Paul's episcopate so soon, how strong soever they may be, are not sufficient to make us give up an opinion, [that is founded not only upon Rufinus, Socrates, and Sozomen, but likewise upon S. Athanasius,] τ who says expressly that the letter of the Council of Jerusalem orders Arius and his associates to be receiv'd Ἄρειον καὶ τὸν σὺν αὐτῷ, and approves of all Arius's wickedness. υ Valesius says, that they receiv'd him by receiving his disciples. [But I do not know whether this answer can be look'd upon as tolerable.]

φ The Eusebians of the Council of Antioch in 341, declare likewise that they had receiv'd Arius the Priest, after having examin'd and approv'd of his faith. [This relates pretty plainly to the Council of Jerusalem:] χ and yet Valesius is oblig'd to say, that this may be some older Council. [But how will that agree with S. Athanasius,] ψ who says that the Council of Jerusalem is the first of the Eusebian Councils?

ω Valesius asks, why Constantine requir'd of Arius a new declaration of his faith, if he had been receiv'd in the Council of Jerusalem; why S. Alexander of Constantinople refus'd to admit him into the Church; why S. Serapion consulted S. Athanasius, to know whether he died in peace with the Catholick communion. [It is very easy to answer him as to the two last, it being certain that the Catholicks never had any regard to what was done in the Council of Jerusalem, as may be seen in the text §. 24.] α Thus S. Athanasius took care to answer, that Arius died out of the communion of the Church. For he proves it by his death itself, [without putting himself to the trouble of examining, whether any Council had receiv'd him or no.

π *Socr. n. p.* 1. *p.* 183, 184. ρ *p.* 183. 1. *b.* σ *Cave, p.* 90. *a.* τ *Ath. de syn. p.* 891. *c.* υ *Socr. n. p.* 183. 2. *d.* φ *Ath. de syn p.* 892. *a.* χ *Socr. n. p.* 184. 1. *a.* ψ *Ath. de syn. p.* 891. *c.* ω *Socr. n. p.* 184. 1. *b*, *c.* α *Ath. de Ar. p.* 670. *d.*

Con-

Conſtantine himſelf had ſome reaſon to require of Arius a new aſſurance of his faith; ſince if the other Churches had not as yet proteſted againſt his abſolution,] β authors declare ſufficiently that at leaſt that of Alexandria had. [We may preſume the ſame thing of S. Alexander of Conſtantinople, and S. James of Niſibis who was then at Court.] γ Socrates himſelf ſays, that Conſtantine was given to underſtand, that Arius was relaps'd in hereſy, or rather that he had never left it. [Valeſius himſelf is concern'd to anſwer this kind of objections,] δ ſince he acknowledges that Arius was abſolv'd by a Council.

ε He ſeems to lay a great deal of ſtreſs upon Macarius's being at Conſtantinople at the time of Arius's death, and his being in the ſame city a long time before the Council of Tyre was held. [This would be ſtrong indeed, if it was impoſſible that there ſhould be two Macarius's at that time,] ζ or even that one could not go twice to Conſtantinople.

[I even believe, we may ſay that the expreſſion of the Council of Jeruſalem, τοῦ σὺν Ἀρείου, ought to include Arius, not only becauſe it ſeldom does not, but likewiſe becauſe it was not the Council's buſineſs to name Arius without neceſſity, when they wrote to the Church of Alexandria, where he was very odious.

It is likewiſe plain, that by this expreſſion the Arch-heretick muſt be underſtood, and not] η the other Arius an accomplice in his hereſy, to whom Valeſius would be glad ſometimes to have that apply'd which is ſaid of the abſolution of Arius by the Council of Jeruſalem. [For this ſecond Arius never made any particular figure, ſo far was he from being capable of being look'd upon as the head of his ſect;] θ and even S. Athanaſius does not ſay one ſingle word of him: ι So that it is ridiculous to believe it is him he means, when he ſpeaks of Arius being receiv'd with his diſciples by the Council.

NOTE XVII. referr'd to in §. 21. p. 62.

Upon Arius's confeſſion of faith reported by Socrates.

κ SOcrates reports a confeſſion of faith of Arius and Euzoïus, preſented to Conſtantine, when he had a mind to ſend them back to Alexandria, before the perſecutions of S. Athanaſius, [that is at the end of 330, according to our opinion. Sozomen whoſe account is ſufficiently perplex'd,] λ ſeems as if he would

β *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *p.* 167. 1. | *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 37. *p.* 72. *d.* | *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 28, 29. *p.* 488, 489. γ *Socr. p.* 73. *a.* δ *n. p.* 184. 1. *a.* ε *c, d.* ζ *Pagi*, 340. §. 14. η *Socr. n. p.* 161. 2. *c.* θ *Pagi*, 340. §. 15. ι §. 15. | *Cave, p.* 90. 2. κ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 26. *p.* 61, 62. λ *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 27. *p.* 485, 486.

have it that Arius and Euzoïus did not preſent this confeſſion till about the time of the Council of Jeruſalem, [in 335.] μ In this he appears to have had a mind to follow Rufinus, [who confounds every thing after his uſual way.] ν What is certain, is, that when Conſtantine wrote to the Biſhops in 335, he ſent them a confeſſion of faith which the Arians had preſented to him; and upon this they were receiv'd by the Council of Jeruſalem. ξ There is not much reaſon to doubt but this is that which Socrates and Sozomen give us, as Father Pagi maintains: [For without doubt care was taken to preſerve it; and we have no other belonging to that time. It is eaſy to believe on the other hand, that Arius had given in ſome declaration of his faith before Conſtantine undertook in 331 to have him receiv'd by S. Athanaſius. So we thought it beſt to follow Socrates in this point; and ſay that before the Councils of Tyre and Jeruſalem, Arius had preſented again to Conſtantine the ſame confeſſion of faith that he had preſenteā to him five years before. If they were two different ones, we may ſtill be certain they were pretty like one another.]

NOTE XVIII. referr'd to in §. 21. p. 63.

Rufinus's miſtakes in Conſtantine's letter to the Council of Jeruſalem.

• RUfinus ſays, that Conſtantine deſir'd the Council of Jeruſalem to receive Arius, if Alexander his Biſhop conſented to it. [S. Alexander was dead a long time before: but perhaps Conſtantine might deſire the conſent of the Biſhop of Alexandria, without naming him. For tho' Rufinus ſpeaks of the Council of Jeruſalem, which was not held till after the depoſition of S. Athanaſius, yet Conſtantine was ignorant of this depoſition; and there is all the probability in the world that he wrote to the Biſhops who were to meet at Tyre or at Jeruſalem:] π For we find that the Arians were at Tyre. [But it is apply'd to the Council of Jeruſalem, becauſe the thing was executed there.]

ρ Rufinus adds, that Conſtantine alledg'd the moderation of the Council [of Nice,] which had condemn'd Arius's tenets and not his perſon; [which is very hard to reconcile with Rufinus himſelf.] σ Sozomen who copies almoſt word for word what he ſays in this place, [puts down nothing of it: And tho' that was favourable to Arius, yet] τ his partiſans who receiv'd him at Jeruſalem, do not ſay that Conſtantine wrote any thing like it.

μ *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *p.* 167. 1. ν *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 890. *d.* ξ *Pagi*, 340. §. 13. ο *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *p.* 167. 1. π *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 801. *a.* ρ *Ruf. p.* 167. 1. σ *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 27. *p.* 486. *a.* τ *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 890, 891.

NOTE

NOTE XIX. referr'd to in §. 21. p. 64.

Errors, in the letter of the Council of Jeruſalem corrected.

υ S. Athanaſius applies ſo often and ſo poſitively to his perſon and his condemnation, what the Euſebians ſay, that they had baniſh'd envy and malice out of the Church, before they receiv'd Arius into it, [that it is impoſſible to doubt this being the ſenſe of their letter. And yet it ſeems pretty difficult to find out this ſenſe according to what we have at preſent in the printed copies. It is likely therefore that inſtead of πάντα μὲν ἐξοεί σας τ ἐκκλησίας τῷ Θεῷ φθόνον, κ) πᾶσαν μαχρὰν ἀπελάσας βασκανίαν, it ſhould be read π. μ. ἐξοεί σα]ας τ.ε.τ.Θ. φ. κ. π. μ. ἀπελάσα]ας βασκανίαν, and a little after ἤπλωμένη δὲ ἦ, inſtead of δὲ, or take that δὲ quite away, and underſtand all the words as ſpoken not by Conſtantine, as they ſeem to be at firſt, but by the Biſhops who write; in which S. Athanaſius who without doubt had ſeen Conſtantine's letter, could not be deceiv'd. It is only in this ſenſe that it is true, as Socrates tells it,] φ that they obſerv'd indirectly that they had baniſh'd S. Athanaſius. [It would be more eaſy to correct only ἐξοείσαι and ἀπελάσαι. But this would be putting the words in Conſtantine's mouth.]

NOTE XX. referr'd to in §. 22. p. 64.

That there is no reaſon to ſay, that Arius was receiv'd only by a part of the Council of Jeruſalem.

χ WHAT S. Athanaſius ſays, that thoſe who receiv'd Arius in the Council of Jeruſalem, deſtroy'd in a corner of the world the great Council of Nice, ↓ makes Baronius think, that the Arians were receiv'd only by Euſebius's faction, who ſtay'd on purpoſe at Jeruſalem after the other Biſhops were return'd to their Churches. [But this conjecture is very weak to found ſo conſiderable a thing upon, which no hiſtorian has mention'd, all ſaying plainly that the Arians were receiv'd by the Council of Jeruſalem. Conſtantine by ſending immediately after] ω to all the Biſhops of the Council of Tyre to come to Conſtantinople, [ſuppos'd at leaſt that they were ſtill together; and S. Athana-

υ *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 890. *c.* 891. *e.* &c. | *t.* 1. *B. p.* 734. *b.* φ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 33. *p.* 69. *a.* χ *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 802. *a, b.* ↓ *Bar.* 335. §. 54. ω *Ath. ap.* 2. 803, 804.

ſius confirms it;] α when he ſays that upon this order only the Euſebians went to Court, and hindred the other Biſhops from going thither. β Socrates and Sozomen obſerve likewiſe, that the Council did not ſeparate till this time. [Not but that it ſeems difficult to know why S. Athanaſius ſays that was done in a corner, which was done at Jeruſalem in an aſſembly, that Euſebius repreſents to us as equal to the Council of Nice. But it may always be ſaid, that the works of darkneſs are acted in darkneſs: and wicked people, how great ſoever their numbers may be, are eſteem'd as nothing in the eyes of God and his Saints.]

NOTE XXI. referr'd to in §. 23. p. 68.

A paſſage of S. Athanaſius concerning Aſterius corrected.

γS. Athanaſius ſays in one place, that Arius had copied this blaſphemy from Aſterius, that the Father had created the Son to make the other creatures by him. δ In the ſequel of the ſame treatiſe he reports ſome other blaſphemies of the Euſebians copied by Aſterius, and adds, ἃ περὶ αὐτῶν ὁ Ἀρείῳ μαθών, [which makes no ſenſe. We muſt take away μαθὼν as being repeated from the line above, and indeed the tranſlator omits it; or elſe put παρ' αὐτῶν inſtead of περὶ αὐτῶν, and this may be confirm'd by what S. Athanaſius adds, *as I have already ſaid.* It is eaſy to imagine, that Arius might publiſh ſome blaſphemies before Aſterius, and take others from him.] ε The Benedictin edition does not clear up this paſſage.

NOTE XXII. referr'd to in §. 25. p. 73.

Upon the different relations of Arius's death.

[WE content ourſelves with giving an account in the text of Arius's death, as we can pick it out of the authors; and we are of opinion that the plain relation of the truth is of itſelf ſufficient to refute ſeveral particulars which we could not make agree with the reſt, without thinking it neceſſary to examine all theſe difficulties by themſelves. We ſhall only obſerve,] ζ that Baronius ſuppoſes Arius's death to have happen'd upon the Sunday morning, and grounds his opinion upon a paſſage of S. Athanaſius, the tranſlation of which imports that it was be-

α *p.* 805. *a.* β *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 35. *p.* 71. *a.* | *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 28. *p.* 488. *c.* γ *Ath. dec. Nic. p.* 256. *a.* δ *p.* 269. *a.* ε *t.* 1. *B. p.* 225. *f.* ζ *Bar.* 336. §. 54.

fore

fore the riſing of the ſun. ν But ſince in the Greek it is quite contrary, that it was before ſun-ſet, ἔπω ἔδυ, [this paſſage muſt be put at the head of all the others that make us believe it happen'd on the Saturday evening, tho' Ruſinus and Theodorit ſay the contrary.]

NOTE XXIII. referr'd to in §. 29. p. 88.

That S. Lucius might be come to Rome in the year 340.

[WE cannot well doubt but] θ thoſe who accus'd S. Lucius of Adrianople of throwing the holy Myſteries to dogs, after he return'd [from baniſhment, turn'd him a ſecond time out of his ſee; tho' we had not for this] ι the teſtimony of Socrates and Sozomen. [It is therefore a vain attempt] κ in Blondel to endeavour to deſtroy what theſe authors ſay, that S. Lucius came to Rome about the year 340, to deſire help of Julius, upon what S. Athanaſius ſays, λ that he was loaded with chains: from whence Blondel inferrs, that he had not the liberty of going to Rome. [He might be chain'd and afterwards let looſe in one and the ſame baniſhment; and it is ſtill more probable, that he was chain'd during his firſt baniſhment, and came to Rome in the ſecond.] μ The Arians themſelves ſay, that he and ſome others went about every where to complain of their judges, and to get themſelves reſtor'd to their biſhopricks, if they could. [For it is plain that inſtead of *Paulum & Lucium*, which has no ſenſe in it, it ſhould be read in that place, *Paulus & Lucius*.]

NOTE XXIV. referr'd to in §. 29. p. 90.

Whether Theodulus of Trajanople aſſiſted at the Council of Sardica.

ν THE Council of Sardica ſpeaking of Biſhop Theodulus who was condemn'd to death at the proſecution of the Euſebians, gives him the title of Bleſſed, ὁ μακαείτης, [as if he were already dead. And yet if it is him of Trajanople, as in all likelihood it is, we do not ſee how it is poſſible to doubt, conſidering] ξ what S. Athanaſius ſays, that he was alive after the holding of this Council. ο Socrates makes him even ſurvive Conſtans who died in

ν *Ath. or.* 1. *p.* 302. *a.* θ *Hil. fr.* 2. *p.* 14. *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 15. *p.* 91. *c. Soz. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.* 507. *c.* *Ind. prim.*
λ *Ath. ſol. p.* 821. *a.* *Bar.* 347. §. 91. ν *Ath.*
ap. 2. *p.* 762. *c.* ξ *Ath. ſol. p.* 821. *a, b.* ο *Socr.*
l. 2. *c.* 26. *p.* 117. *b.*

350. [But he does not appear to have known any thing of him but by S. Athanasius, according to whom he should place what he says of him in 347 or 348.]

π In our text of S. Athanasius we read only, ὁ ἦν συλλειτουργὸς, &c. [and the verb is wanting. So that we must follow] ρ what we find in Theodorit, ἀνέστη γὰρ ὁ συλλειτουργός. Father Sirmondus has translated it *excessit*, [which may signify that Theodulus was oblig'd to quit his Church, or even that he was dead. S. Hilary seems to have understood it in this last sense,] σ for in the translation of this passage which is to be met with in his fragments, we read *decessit enim... Theodorus.* τ Valesius maintains, that this is the sense which should be embrac'd, because Theodulus is call'd *Blessed.* But immediately after he owns, that S. Athanasius gives us all the reason in the world to believe that Theodulus was alive still, and that therefore we may translate ἀνέστη by *sedem suam reliquit.* He even informs us, that Epiphanius and some other translators have inferr'd from thence that Theodulus was present at the Council. [And indeed ἀνέστη signifies naturally enough, that he rose up in the assembly to charge the Eusebians with persecuting him; whereas I do not know how it can signify that he was dead.] υ The Benedictins in their new edition have made it ἀπέθανεν ἦν ὁ συλλειτουργὸς, &c. upon the authority of a manuscript in the King's library: and they pretend, that it cannot be said that Theodulus did not die till after the Council of Sardica. They observe very well, that the term μακαρίτης, which is apply'd only to a dead man, is entirely favourable to their opinion. φ You may see how they explain the passage where S. Athanasius represents him as still alive at the time of the holding of this Council. χ As to the rest, Valesius says very readily that this Theodulus is him of Trajanople.

NOTE XXV. referr'd to in §. 29. p. 91.

Upon Marcellus martyr'd, as is said, at Nicomedia.

[AMong those whom the persecution of the Arians martyr'd in the East, we did not think we ought to reckon Marcellus, whom many martyrologies place on the 26th of November, as a Martyr at Nicomedia; because there is reason to fear he is not a different man from Marculus the pretended martyr of the Donatists in Numidia. We have discours'd of this matter under the title of the Donatists. §. 47.]

π *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 762. *c.*
ρ *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 590. *a.*
σ *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 9.
τ *Thdrt. n. p.* 19. 2. *d.*
υ *Ath. t.* 1. *B. p.* 163. *f.*
φ *p.* 354. *e.*
χ *Thdrt. n. p.* 19. 2. *d.*

Note

NOTE XXVI. referr'd to in §. 30. p. 94.

That the twenty five Canons aſcrib'd to the Council of the Dedication, may belong to two Councils.

ϕ WE have in Dionyſius Exiguus, and in all the other collections of Councils, of which there are ſome that are thought to be ancienter than the Council of Chalcedon, a body of twenty five Canons aſcrib'd to a Council of Antioch, plac'd after thoſe of Nice and Gangra, and before thoſe of Laodicea and Conſtantinople; [which gives ground to think they were made about the middle of the fourth Century; and they are uſually all aſcrib'd to the Council of the Dedication; that is, to that which the Euſebians held at Antioch in the beginning of the year 341, for the dedication of the great Church.] ω This we find expreſly in a collection which is thought to belong to the fifth age, and in that of Dionyſius Exiguus, tho' there are ſeveral manuſcripts of this laſt, where the word *in Encæniis* is not read. α Socrates indeed aſſures us that this Council made ſome laws.

β He particularly aſcribes to it a Canon againſt thoſe Biſhops, who having been depoſed, ſhould take poſſeſſion of their Biſhopricks again without the authority of a Council. γ This is pretty plainly what is enjoin'd in the fourth and twelfth Canons of Antioch. δ Theophilus and the other enemies to S. Chryſoſtom made uſe alſo of a like Canon in order to depoſe this Saint; and it was anſwer'd, that this Canon was made by hereticks who communicated with Arius, ε and by Arians who made it on purpoſe to condemn S. Athanaſius; ζ ſo that it was rejected by Pope Julius, the Council of Sardica, and all thoſe who declar'd for the innocence of S. Athanaſius. Socrates ſays expreſly, that it was made at Antioch. η 'Tis true, Palladius cites the Canon produc'd by Theophilus in terms pretty different from thoſe of the Council of Antioch, and ſays it was made by forty Arians, [whereas there were ninety or ninety ſeven Biſhops in the Council of the Dedication. But there may be a miſtake in the number forty; and tho' the words in Palladius are different from the fourth Canon of Antioch, the ſenſe is perfectly the ſame.

There is therefore ſome ground to aſcribe the twenty five Canons to the Council of the Dedication; but there is ſome reaſon

ϕ *Schel de Ant. p.* 145. ω *p.* 145, 146. α *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 10. *p.* 88. *c.* β *c.* 8. *p.* 85. *a.* γ *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 564, 568. δ *Pall. v. Chry. p.* 78. ε *p.* 76. ζ *p.* 78. | *Conc. p.* 1303. *d*, *e.* | *Socr. l.* 6. *c.* 18. *p.* 327. *b.* η *Pall. p.* 78.

to doubt whether this foundation be ſtrong enough to bear the aſcribing them all to it. For it is eaſy to think that the Canons of ſeveral Councils of Antioch might be join'd together, that afterward they might he aſcrib'd to only one of them, becauſe it was the moſt celebrated one, and that the memory of the reſt might perhaps be entirely loſt. In this manner they have join'd in one body the Canons of the Councils of Africa in the time of Aurelius: But there is care taken to diſtinguiſh to what Council every one belongs; and they may have neglected this precaution in thoſe of Antioch. We find the Canons of Sardica cited by Popes as Canons of Nice; and there can be no better reaſon given for it, but that they were written one after another without being diſtinguiſh'd by a particular title, as we find it ſtill in the manuſcript which Father Queſnel printed in the ſecond tome of his S. Leo.

It remains now to ſee whether there is any reaſon to believe, that the like confuſion has happen'd among the Canons of Antioch. The agreement between the 13th and the 22d Canon has appear'd to be ſuch to perſons of judgment.] θ For tho' the firſt ſeems to be made particularly to hinder Biſhops from going to ordain other Biſhops out of their provinces, ι and the ſecond to forbid them ordaining Prieſts and Deacons out of their own Dioceſe; [yet both the one and the other forbids 'em after ſuch a general manner exerciſing any part of their office out of their ordinary juriſdiction, that we may ſay either of them would be enough without the other, eſpecially the firſt.

There are likewiſe ſeveral of theſe Canons which one may reaſonably ſay are too good and holy to come from perſons ſo deſtitute of the Holy Spirit, as the Euſebians were. The ordination of Gregory is too plainly condemn'd by the 19th, and the ſeveral tranſlations of Euſebius by the 21ſt, for us to believe that they either made them, or ſuffer'd them to be made by others. Moreover, how could Biſhops, who were ſo great courtiers as thoſe of the Council of the Dedication were, make a Canon ſo ſevere as the eleventh is againſt Biſhops going to court? It is alſo remarkable, that they are not expreſs'd after the ſame manner. For ſome make a perfect and complete diſcourſe, others of them are only in the form of titles.] κ The firſt ſpeaks of Conſtantine rather as alive than dead. [And I do not know, whether the Euſebians would ever allow any authority to the Council of Nice in the time of Conſtantius, by ſpeaking of it with ſo much reſpect as this Canon does.]

λ At the head of theſe Canons there is a ſynodical epiſtle concerning ſome regulations made by a Council of Antioch, which is addreſs'd to all the Biſhops of Syria: It is ſhort, and ſpeaks of nothing but peace and charity, [which the Euſebians were very far from. But this is not ſo ſufficient a reaſon for us to believe that it is not theirs, (for the mouth often ſpeaks contrary to the heart,) as the title of the letter,] which mentions the provinces

θ *Conc. p.* 568. ι *p.* 572. | *Sckel. p.* 554. κ *Conc. p.* 561. *b.* λ *p.* 560.

of

of which the Council was compos'd. For they are all of the Patriarchate of Antioch, [and there is no mention made either of Cappadocia or Thrace, or of many other provinces, the principal Biſhops of which aſſiſted at the Council of the year 341.]

μ To this letter are join'd the ſubſcriptions of about thirty Biſhops, all likewiſe of the Provinces belonging to the Patriarchate of Antioch. And among theſe thirty Biſhops, there is not any of thoſe who are taken notice of in hiſtory as the chief men in the Council of the Dedication, or who for the moſt part poſſeſs'd the principal ſees in the Eaſt,] except Macedonius of Mopſueſtia, and Narciſſus of Irenopolis or Neronias. ν On the contrary among them we meet with Theodorus [or rather Theodotus] of Laodicea in Syria, [who died before the Council of Tyre in the year 335, at which Synod George his ſucceſſor aſſiſted as well as at that of Antioch in the year 341.] ξ There is alſo Anatolius of Emiſa among them, [tho' we are ſure that Euſebius was made Biſhop of Emiſa at the beginning of the Council.]

ο We find likewiſe among them S. James of Niſibis and S. Baſil of Neocæſarea, [famous Confeſſors, tho' no body ever ſaid that theſe two Saints aſſiſted at the Council of the Dedication; and it would be breaking in upon the reſpect we owe to their piety, to imagine that they had any hand in what was done at this unrighteous aſſembly.] π This obliges Baronius to ſay that S. James, and the others of the Orthodox, who he pretends aſſiſted at the Council in 341, us'd all their endeavours to oppoſe the Euſebian faction. [But this he ſays upon his own authority, and there is nothing like it to be met with in hiſtory.

It is is much more eaſy to ſave the credit of theſe Saints, and remove the other difficulties we have mention'd, particularly the ſubſcriptions of Theodotus and Anatolius, by ſaying that two different Councils of Antioch are confounded together, that of the Dedication in the year 341, aſſembled from all the parts of the Eaſt, and another from the Patriarchate of Antioch only, and which was certainly held before the year 335; for George, Theodotus's ſucceſſor, aſſiſted that year at the Council of Tyre. Therefore we may place this firſt Council in the time of S. Euſtathius, to whoſe holineſs part of theſe twenty five Canons is very agreeable. The reunion of the Church of Antioch, of which this ſynodical letter ſpeaks, agrees very well with the hiſtory of S. Euſtathius. ı And I cannot ſee on the other hand how S. James of Niſibis could affirm that this Church was perfectly united, after it was miſerably torn in pieces by the unjuſt depoſition of S. Euſtathius. But if it be objected that we do not read the name of S. Euſtathius among the ſubſcriptions; neither do we meet with the name of any other Biſhop of Antioch, tho' the letter which ſtands before theſe ſubſcriptions was writ in that city.]

ı See his title.

ρ Theſe conjectures were propos'd in the life of S. Athanaſius, to be examin'd by the judicious. σ And we find by an author

μ *p.* 559 --- 562. ν *p.* 560. ξ *p.* 559. ο *p.* 559, 560.
π *Bar.* 341. §. 27. ρ *Ath. vie, t.* 1. *p.* 715. σ *Schel. de Ant. p.* 143.

who

who undertook to write againſt them, that they were well receiv'd by the publick, and generally maintain'd their ground. [For this reaſon we have taken the liberty to follow them, and to omit in the text ſeveral things which do not ſeem to relate to the Council of the Dedication. We have only given an account there of all the Canons together, which we were not willing to ſeparate, becauſe there are a great many of them, which it is not eaſy to ſay to which of the two Councils they belong. As to the reaſons which Schelſtratus advances againſt diſtinguiſhing between the two Councils of Antioch, we do not ſee that any of them are conſiderable, or that he has given any ſolid anſwer to what is alledg'd to eſtabliſh this diſtinction.]

NOTE XXVII. referr'd to in §. 30. p. 94.

That what is ſaid of the thirty ſix Euſebian Biſhops in the Council of Antioch, has no foundation.

τ BAronius and ſeveral others after him relate, that of the ninety or ninety ſeven Biſhops of the Council of Antioch in 341, there were only thirty ſix who were of Euſebius's party; but then they have grounded all this upon nothing but a paſſage υ in Pope Julius, where they confound μόνων, which is derived from μόνος, with μονῶν, from μονή, ſtatio, *a day's journey*. For the ſenſe of this place isnot as Baronius believ'd, that S. Gregory was ordain'd by thirty ſix Biſhops, but that he was thirty ſix days journey from the place he was deſign'd for, tho' the Canons enjoin that a Biſhop ſhall be ordain'd in the preſence of thoſe he is to govern. And indeed it is reckon'd about thirty ſix days journey from Antioch to Alexandria.

Φ What is ſaid of theſe thirty ſix Euſebian Biſhops may be better ſupported from Palladius, who aſcribes to forty Arian Biſhops the Canon made againſt S. Athanaſius, that is the fourth of thoſe of Antioch; and he is follow'd in this by George of Alexandria, who after him wrote the life of S. Chryſoſtom. Schelſtratus thinks this ground enough to ſay that after the ninety Biſhops had made the twenty five Canons we now have, Euſebius ſtay'd with forty others of his party to make a new Canon againſt S. Athanaſius, and afterwards conſecrate Gregory in his room. [It would be ſtill more eaſy to ſay there were at firſt but forty Biſhops at the Council, who made the 4th Canon, and ordain'd S. Gregory. But ſince S. Athanaſius, S. Hilary, and all the reſt aſcribe in general all that was done at Antioch to ninety or ninety ſeven Biſhops, we have reaſon to think, that this τεσσαρακονθα was put for ἐνενηκονθα through a mere blunder of Palladius or his tranſcriber, and that George copied it as he found it.]

τ *Socr. n. p.* 180. | *Schel. p.* 49, 50. υ *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 748. | *t.* 1° *B. p.* 148. *f.* Φ *Schel. p.* 51, 52. | *Pall. v. Chry. p.* 78.

NOTE

NOTE XXVIII. referr'd to in §. 31. p. 94.

Upon what Schelſtratus advances to endeavour to juſtify one part of the Council of Antioch.

[SChelſtratus who has taken upon him to maintain the authority of the twenty five Canons of Antioch, and for that end to defend the honour of the Council of the Dedication, in which he pretends they were all made,] χ diſtinguiſhes between two parts of this Council, one of which he juſtifies, the other he condemns. He ſays, that at firſt the Canons were made by all the ninety or ninety ſeven Biſhops of the Council, made up of Orthodox and Euſebians, but that the latter diſguis'd their deſigns and opinions, and that afterwards the majority of the Biſhops going away, forty Euſebians ſtaid and made the Canon related by Palladius, which is taken from the 4th and 12th of thoſe that were firſt made, declar'd S. Athanaſius guilty for breaking this Canon, and then conſecrated Gregory in his ſtead.

[There may ſeveral things be ſaid to this: But it is ſufficient to obſerve, that the difference he makes between the fourth Canon and that in Palladius, is abſolutely none at all as to ſenſe.] ↓ The fourth, ſays Schelſtratus, does not, as the other, ſay any thing of Biſhops, whether juſtly or unjuſtly depos'd. ω But ſince it declares that a depos'd Biſhop, who is reinſtated without the authority of a Council, can never be receiv'd to juſtify himſelf, [it comprehends without diſtinction every Biſhop whether juſtly or unjuſtly depos'd. And this of itſelf was enough either for Euſebius againſt S. Athanaſius, or for Theophilus againſt S. Chryſoſtom. So that it is unlikely that Euſebius having at hand the fourth Canon made in a ſolemn manner by near a hundred Biſhops, would cauſe another to be made like it, which would be of leſs authority, and ſerve no other purpoſe but to diſcredit his conduct.] α And ſuppoſing George does add to the puniſhment of depoſition that of perpetual baniſhment, which the Canons of Antioch ſay nothing of; [he is to anſwer for this addition to Palladius: and he is not an author of credit enough to give us any trouble.

It muſt then be look'd upon as certain, that the fourth Canon of Antioch is that, which was made againſt S. Athanaſius, which S. Chryſoſtom endeavour'd to obſerve, as Schelſtratus proves, to take away the leaſt pretence from his enemies, and which he nevertheleſs rejected with Pope Innocent as made by hereticks and Arians, and as condemn'd by Julius and the Council of Sardica. This remark is enough to overturn the whole Scheme of Schelſtratus.] β But to this muſt be added, that he confeſſes that Socrates is againſt him, γ by ſaying that S. Atha-

χ *Schel. de Ant. p.* 665, 669. *& alibi.* ↓ *p.* 671. ω *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 564. *b.* α *Schel. p.* 671. β *p.* 662. γ *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 8. *p.* 85. *a.*

naſius's

nasius's affair was the first which was examin'd at Antioch: And he owns likewise that Sozomen and all the rest afterwards have follow'd Socrates. ε But to them he opposes Palladius, [who says nothing to the contrary, as we have seen in the preceding Note. A Canon or two made on purpose to oppress S. Athanasius, are not sufficient to shew they did not begin with his affair. And we cannot conclude from thence that the other Canons were made at the same time; it being easy for them to resolve upon them at different times according to the occasions which presented, to put them together and reduce them into a body at the end of the session.] Schelstratus pretends that they were always oblig'd in Councils to begin with what regarded the faith; [as if this was a proof that they always did so.] ϛ He alledges these words of Pope Julius: *When Athanasius had been found guilty after the Council, &c.* as a clear and convincing proof of his opinion, supposing this to be the Synod of Antioch, tho' it may be understood of that of Tyre, and it is even plain it ought to be so understood. ζ He pretends that the same Pope ascribes all the calamities of the Church to a small number of people, and that therefore the blame cannot be laid upon the ninety Bishops of the Council of Antioch. η Julius indeed says, that a few were the authors of these evils; [but he does not deny, that they were follow'd by a great number of others who suffer'd themselves to be drawn away by the principal men out of complaisance or thro' cowardice against their own judgment.

We see therefore no reason to give up] θ what Socrates says, that the affair of S. Athanasius was the first thing treated of in the Council of Antioch. [Which agrees perfectly with the notion that history gives us,] ι that this was the true business of the Council, as Socrates positively affirms. [Schelstratus himself does not make the Council begin till 341, and as early as Lent that year Gregory was already master of the Churches of Alexandria.]

NOTE XXIX. referr'd to in §. 31. p. 97.

That Eusebius Bishop of Emisa is a different person from Eusebius of Emisa surnam'd Pittacus, whom Gallus executed in the year 354.

κ AMmianus speaks of one Eusebius of Emisa, surnam'd Pittacus, whom he calls *concitatum oratorem*, and who he observes was skilful in the laws. He relates how Gallus put him to death in the year 354, for reasons of state, and praises the

ε *Schel. p. 663.* ϛ *p. 665.* | *Ath. ap. 2. p. 749. a.* ζ *Schel. p. 669.* η *Ath. p. 752. b, c.* θ *Soor. l. 2. c. 8. p. 85. a.* ι *p. 84. d.* κ *Amm. l. 14. p. 18. b.* | 22

com

conſtancy with which he ſuffer'd the unjuſt violence of this Prince. [We do not find that any body ſays, that this Euſebius is the ſame with the Biſhop of Emiſa who liv'd and died in Conſtantius's reign, and we do not think there is any reaſon to ſay ſo. The death of a Biſhop was a remarkable thing in Conſtantius's time, eſpecially of this Biſhop who was belov'd by this Prince. Ammianus would have taken notice of his character as a Biſhop, which was reſpected then even by the pagans, and of the ſevere puniſhment which Conſtantius would not have fail'd to have inflicted for the fact. There is ſomething of his death to be met with likewiſe in Socrates and Sozomen, who ſpeak pretty largely of Biſhop Euſebius, and cite the panegyrick which George of Laodicea had written upon him. And indeed from the manner in which Ammianus ſpeaks of him who was executed in 354, there is all the reaſon in the world to believe he was a lawyer.]

NOTE XXX. referr'd to in §. 32. p. 99.

That the Biſhop ſuſpected of Sabellianiſm in the Council of Antioch, was not in all likelihood either Gregory of Alexandria or Marcellus of Ancyra.

λ BAronius underſtands of Gregory of Alexandria what S. Hilary ſays, that there was in the Council of Antioch a Biſhop ſuſpected of an error different from that of Arianiſm. [But he does not give any reaſon for thinking ſo; and if the error mention'd by S. Hilary be Sabellianiſm, as is probable enough, I think Gregory could not by any means be ſuſpected on that ſide: and he might probably be then at Alexandria, when they made the ſecond Creed at Antioch againſt the Biſhop S. Hilary takes notice of.]

μ Schelſtratus will have it, that this Biſhop was Marcellus of Ancyra, [who was certainly accuſed of errors oppoſite to the Arians; but no body ſays that he aſſiſted at the Council of Antioch.] ν Theophronius's confeſſion of faith, which is alledg'd, [proves it as little of him as of Sabellius; and tho' he had had a mind to come thither, the Euſebians would no more have receiv'd him than S. Athanaſius. So that all that Schelſtratus ſays, will not hinder us from believing he was then at Rome, and had been ſo for near a year before [1].]

1 See his title.

λ *Bar.* 341. §. 22. | *Hil. ſyn. p.* 128. 2. *a.* μ *Schel. de Ant. p.* 123. ν *p.* 124.

NOTE

NOTE XXXI. referr'd to in §. 35. p. 107.

That the letter of the Eusebians to Pope Julius was written by the Council of the Dedication of the Church of Antioch.

ξ THE letter of the Eusebians which was carried to Julius by his legates, was written from Antioch by Eusebius, Dianius, and many others; [that is without doubt by a Council, and this Council cannot be any other but that of the Dedication. This is but too clear and certain of itself.] ο Baronius maintains it is a plain mistake in Socrates and Sozomen to ascribe it to a later Council, π assembled some months after the former, when they compos'd the fourth confession, which they sent into the West by four of their principal Bishops. [But it could not come from this Council;] ρ for Julius in his answer, instead of speaking of so solemn a deputation, testifies that no body came on the part of the Eusebians, tho' he had expected it a long time. [We shall 1 observe,] σ that the Eusebians detain'd this Pope's legates till the month of June. So that we think we may say that the Council of the Dedication which met at fartheſt in March, lasted till towards June.

1 S. Julius, Note 3.

NOTE XXXII. referr'd to in §. 35. p. 107.

That Eusebius of Nicomedia might die in July or August, Anno 341.

τ EUsebius of Nicomedia died according to Sozomen a little time after the Council of Antioch, before he knew the result of the Council held at Rome [in June 341; so that he might die in July or August.] υ Socrates in one place says the same thing with Sozomen, [only that one cannot tell whether the Council which he says follow'd the death of Eusebius, be that of Rome or Antioch, which makes little difference, that of Antioch in all likelihood lasting till June, when that of Rome began.] φ He says in another place, that he was then dead when the letter came to hand, which he and the others assembled at Antioch wrote to the Pope. [But this is hard to believe, for Julius who staid some time before he answer'd the Eusebians,

ξ *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 739. *d.* ο *Bar.* 341. §. 58. π *Ath. de Syn. p.* 894. *d.* ρ *Ap.* 2. *p.* 740. *c.* σ *p.* 744. *d.* τ *Soz. l.* 3. *c.* 7. *p.* 505, 506. υ *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 12. *p.* 89. *c.* φ *c.* 17. *p.* 94. *c, d.*

and

and in the mean while receiv'd other news from the East, yet mentions nothing of his death. And indeed Socrates says this only by the bye, and perhaps by his τῷ τετελευτηκότι, he did not mean that he was then dead, but that he was the person whose death he had related a little before.] χ S. Athanasius likewise says pretty clearly, that he did not die till after Julius had written. We cannot even according to him place his death but a little before the Council of Sardica. [But the death of Hermogenes which follow'd his, and is plac'd under the Consuls of the year 342, not only by Socrates, but also in the Fasti of Idatius, explains what S. Athanasius says in more general terms.]

NOTE XXXIII. referr'd to in §. 35. p. 108.

That Macedonius was an embroiderer and Priest of Constantinople in the time of Alexander.

↓SOcrates says, that when S. Alexander of Constantinople died [in the year 336,] Macedonius had been a long time Deacon of that Church; but S. Athanasius assures us he was a Priest under S. Paul, in 338, [and there is not any probability that S. Paul, whose declar'd enemy and accuser he was, should raise him to the Priesthood. There is then good reason to believe that Socrates is mistaken, and that Macedonius was a Priest in the time of S. Alexander.

S. Jerom says in his Chronicle that he was *artis plumariæ*, that is an *Embroiderer*.] ω Scaliger pretends that this is a mistake, and that S. Jerom having read in some Greek book that Macedonius was ποικιλότεχνος, that is a cunning artful fellow, he mistook the sense of this word. α He repeats more than once this mistake of S. Jerom's as a thing not to be disputed; β but the only proof he gives of it is, that Macedonius never followed any trade, but pass'd from being a Deacon to the Episcopate, [as if he could not follow a trade when he was a Deacon or a Priest, which was a common thing at that time, as may be seen by all S. Basil's Clergy, and which was even order'd by some Councils. What would make one doubt whether Macedonius was a mechanick, is, that such humility seems too holy for so wicked a man, who could not work out of necessity, because he was rich.] γ For he built the magnificent Church, which afterwards bore the name of S. Paul; [and he built it before he was a Bishop,] δ for he was consecrated in it. ε But since he made an outward profession of piety, [it is no wonder he spent some of his time at a trade which was rather diverting

χ *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 754. *c.* ↓ *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 83. *d.*
ω *Ens. Chr. n. p.* 252. 1. α *Chr. prol. p.* 24. β *n. p.* 252. 1. γ *Soz. l.* 7. *c.* 10. *p.* 716. *d.* δ *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 12. *p.* 89. *d.* ε *c.* 6. *p.* 83. *d.*

than

than troubleſome. It is poſſible likewiſe he might have work'd at his frame before he became an eccleſiaſtick, have got his eſtate by it, and from thence retain a ſurname, as Peter the Fuller did in the following age. So that there is no reaſon to accuſe S. Jerom of being in an error.]

NOTE XXXIV. referr'd to in §. 36. p. 111.

That the fourth confeſſion of faith was not drawn up and ſent into France till the year 342.

ζ BAronius places in 341 the deputation of Narciſſus and the others, who carried the fourth confeſſion of the Arians into France. [But it ſhould rather be plac'd in the year 342, for it did not precede Julius's letter, who it is likely would have ſpoken of it, which he does not;] η nay he even ſays he waited a long time in vain for ſome body to come to him on the part of the Euſebians. θ And beſides we find, that Maris and Theodorus were at Conſtantinople towards the beginning of 342, where they ordain'd Macedonius to ſucceed Euſebius.

ι What S. Athanaſius ſays, that they were ſent as from a Council, ὡς ἀπὸ συνόδου, [does not mean that they really aſſembled a Council for that purpoſe, but rather that they did not. One may perhaps tranſlate it *as from the Council*, as if it was meant of that of Antioch, and it ought to be underſtood ſo if we follow Socrates and Sozomen; but then it ought rather to be read in the Greek ὡς ἀπὸ τ συνόδου.]

NOTE XXXV. referr'd to in §. 37. p. 116.

Difficult paſſages of S. Epiphanius and Marius Mercator concerning Photinus's error.

κ S. Epiphanius ſays that according to Photinus, the Word which came forth from the Father, προελθόντα, was chang'd into fleſh in the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt. [It ſeems hard to reconcile this with others of the Ancients, who make Photinus author of Neſtorianiſm, and entirely oppoſite to Eutychianiſm. You may ſee what Father Petavius ſays upon this in his *Dogmata*, t. 4. l. 1. c. 3. §. 12. p. 13. Whatever may be the meaning of that paſſage,] λ S. Epiphanius himſelf declares that Photinus referr'd divers places of ſcripture to the Word, that he might not be oblig'd to own

ζ *Bar.* 342. §. 25, 26. *l.* 2. *c.* 12. *p.* 89. *d.* 71. *c.* 3. *p.* 831. *b.*
η *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 740. *c.*
ι *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 894. *d.*
λ *c.* 2. *p.* 830.
θ *Socr.*
κ *Epi.*

that

that Jesus Christ existed before his Mother. [He did not therefore believe, according to S. Epiphanius, that the Word and Jesus Christ were one single person.] μ Nestorius positively assures us, that he did not say the Word was made flesh.

[Marius Mercator is no less difficult to reconcile with the rest, who will all have it Photinus was a Sabellian, and did not acknowledge the Person of the Word.] ν For he makes him a pure Nestorian, and an heretick only in the point of the Incarnation, excepting that he did not believe the Word was the Son of God; ξ and he says positively of him, *Verbum Dei non negans esse in substantia.* ο In the following passage where it is read, *Verbum hoc Dei esse in substantia negat*, it ought to be certainly *non negat*, whatever Father Alexander may say to the contrary, *t. 7. p.* 222. [And therefore I think it must be own'd, Mercator was not sufficiently acquainted with Photinus's notions about the Trinity. I also find no body but him, who says positively that this heretick contended that Jesus Christ was born as other men are.]

NOTE XXXVI. referr'd to in §. 38. p. 119.

That we must allow there were two Councils of Milan, one in 345, *the other in* 347, *and that it is the first which Pope Liberius speaks of.*

π FAther Petavius ascribes to the Council of Milan, which we place in 347, what Pope Liberius says, ρ that Demophilus, Macedonius, Eudoxius, and Martyrius, went in a rage out of the Council of Milan, where they would not condemn the heretical opinions of Arius. [But it is pretty difficult to comprehend how these four Eastern Bishops should be at Milan in 347, after what had just happen'd at Sardica and Philippopolis.] σ On the contrary it is certain, that three of these and some others likewise were in Italy in 345, whither they came to bring their long confession; τ and that in this same year Constans being at Milan found divers Bishops there who desir'd of him to have a Council at Sardica, as we have observ'd in the text §. 38. [There is therefore a good deal of probability that we ought to refer what Liberius says to that year. It seems as if the time favour'd Father Petavius, because Liberius says that this happen'd eight years before. Now according to this Father, he wrote in 355.] υ But Baronius makes it very plain, that he wrote in the begin-

μ *Merc. t. 2. p.* 313. 1. ν *p.* 128. §. 17, 19, 21. ξ §. 17.
ο §. 19.. π *Conc. t. 2. p.* 730. ρ *Hil. fr. 2. p.* 41, 42.
σ *Ath. de syn. p.* 895. *d.* τ *ap. 1. p.* 676. υ *Bar.* 354. §. 1.

ning of 354, that is eight years and a few months after the Council held at Milan in 345.

φ Others on the contrary aſcribe to the Council of Milan, which rejected the deputies from the Eaſterns, and which we place in 345, all that we ſhall ſay of another held likewiſe at Milan in 347: and to reconcile matters they place it in 346. [This has its difficulties and its advantages. But there is one difficulty, which I do not ſee how they can remove.] χ For they agree, that this is the Council at which S. Athanaſius was preſent, four years after he came to Rome in 341. [Now from 341 to 346 is five years, and this cannot be explain'd in any other manner.] ψ For S. Athanaſius ſays, that Conſtans wrote to him to come to him at Milan, after three years were paſs'd, in the fourth year, [and not *poſt quatuor annos*, which might be explain'd to mean the fifth,] ω as we underſtand of the ninth what Pope Liberius ſays, *ante annos octo*. [And it muſt be conſider'd likewiſe, that S. Athanaſius rather prolongs than ſhortens the time. For his deſign is to ſhew, that he was in no haſte to ſee Conſtans.]

NOTE XXXVII. referr'd to in §. 38. p. 120.

Upon the condemnation of Euphrates of Cologn.

[THE Acts of the Council of Cologn againſt Euphrates, are become famous by the great number of people who have apply'd themſelves to examine them, ſome to defend them, others to oppoſe them. That what we have to ſay upon them may be the more clear, we ſhall begin with relating the hiſtory of this Council, as we find it in the Acts which we have of it.] α Euphrates had been accus'd in a letter from the people of Cologn, of which place he was Biſhop and of all Germanicia ſecunda, β ſubſcrib'd by a great many people, γ both laïcks and eccleſiaſticks, δ of maintaining that Jeſus Chriſt was not God, ε but a meer man; [which was Photinus's hereſy:] ζ and likewiſe of ſome other crimes. η Five Biſhops, among whom were Valerian of Auxerre and Amandus of Strasburg, θ condemn'd him for a blaſphemer, and depos'd him, ι for his crime was ſo clear and ſo certain, that every Biſhop had power to condemn him according to the diſcipline of the Church.

[Notwithſtanding this he did not retract,] κ but had the impudence to maintain his hereſy before Jeſſæus Biſhop of Spire, Martin of Mentz, and ſeveral Eccleſiaſticks who were with

φ *Socr. n. p.* 24, 25. χ *p.* 25. 1. *a.* ψ *Ath. ap.* 1. *p.* 676. ω *Hil. fr. p.* 41, 42. | *Socr. n. p.* 34. 1. *a, b.* α *Conc. B. t.* 1. *p.* 570. 2. *e.* | 571. *a, b.* β *p.* 571. 1. *a.* γ *d, f.* δ *f.* & *alibi.* ε *d.* ζ *c.* η *c.* θ *c.* ι *P. Aur. p.* 214. κ *Conc. p.* 571. 1. *b, c.*

them;

them ; λ and upon another occaſion beſore S. Servatius of Tongres, and S. Athanaſius himſelf, [who was at Treves in 336 and 337, and who came again afterwards into France in 347 and 349.] μ His error was pernicious to others, and he drew away a great many people by his falſe doctrine. ν S. Servatius who was his neareſt neighbour, oppos'd him more than any body elſe, as well in publick as in private.

ξ But at laſt his blaſphemies being known to all the world, the Biſhops met at Cologn at the deſire of the Faithful [of that city,] ο or of the Biſhops themſelves who had condemn'd him the firſt time. π The Council was held upon the 12th of May 346, and fourteen Prelates were preſent at it, who were S. Maximinus of Treves, Valentine of Arles, S. Donation of Chalon upon the Sône, Severinus of Sens, Optatian of Troies, Jeſſæus of Spire, Victor of Worms, Valerian of Auxerrre, S. Simplicius of Autun, Amandus of Strasburg, Juſtinian of Baſil, Eulogius of Amiens, S. Servatius of Tongres, and Dyſcolius of Reims. ρ Ten other Biſhops alſo ſent thither their conſent and their deputies, namely Martin of Mentz, Victor of Metz, Didierius of Langres, Pancarius of Beſançon, S. Sanctinus of Verdun, Victorinus of Paris, Superior of Cambray, *Nerviorum*, Mercurius of Soiſſons, Euſebius of Rouen, and Diopetus of Orleans σ who gave his vote in a letter which he wrote. τ The Biſhops being aſſembled, the letter from the Church of Cologn was read ; S. Maximinus and all the reſt gave their advice which we have ſtill remaining, and all of them condemn'd Euphrates to be depos'd, and ſome of them to be even depriv'd of lay-communion.

[This is the account we have from the Acts of this Council, which when they are conſider'd in themſelves, cannot be denied to have all poſſible marks of truth.] υ All the Biſhops that are nam'd there except Sanctinus, are likewiſe in the ſubſcriptions to the Council of Sardica, held in the year 347, and they are mention'd there as Biſhops of Gaul, tho' their biſhopricks are not ſet down. Φ The hiſtory of S. Maximinus written in 839 by Lupus of Ferrara, ſpeaks of Euphrates's hereſy, and of his being condemn'd by the Council of Cologn. χ The moſt ancient of the two which we have of S. Severinus of Cologn, and which appears to have been written after S. Gregory of Tours, but before the end of the eighth century, 1 mentions it likewiſe. The life of S. Servatius of Tongres, amidſt all its miſtakes, ſpeaks of it agreeably to the account we have of it in the Councils. ψ That of S. Maximinus of Mentz, which is no better, differs from it more. Many perſons of judgment cite this Council as a genuine piece and of authority, as may be ſeen by Aurelius, *c.* 4.

1 See S. Amandus, Note 2.

λ 2. *b.* μ *a, c.* ν *b.* ξ 570. 2. *f.* ο *Marc. conc. l.* 7. *c.* 2. §. 13. *p.* 216. π *Conc. p.* 570. 2. *d.* ρ *p.* 570. 2. *e.* σ *p.* 571. 2. *c.* τ *p.* 570. 2. *c.* υ *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 767, *c, d.* Φ *Sur.* 29. *may*, §. 5. *p.* 324. 23. *oct.* §. 2. *p.* 358. ψ 18 *nov. c.* 2. §. 16. *p.* 404.

p. 198, 214: Mr. de Marca who always places it in 346, *conc. l.* 6. *c.* 17. §. 2. *p.* 131. | *l.* 7. *c.* 2. §. 13. *p.* 216: Mr. Launoy *pr. l.* 10. *p.* 32: Blondel. *prim. p.* 82: Father Petavius *dog. t.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 3. §. 13. *p.* 14: Mr. Sluſius *de Servat. p.* 28, who thinks that the Council is certain, tho' the year in which it was held is not ſo.

[But for all this,] ω Baronius and ſeveral other perſons who are likewiſe very underſtanding men, make this Council either very ſuſpicious or certainly ſpurious; not ſeeing how it is poſſible that Euphrates could be depos'd this year as a worſe heretick than the Arians, by a Council of moſt of the provinces of France, and of many Saints; and yet that the next year the Council of Sardica, where almoſt all thoſe who condemn'd him were preſent, ſhould not only receive him as a Catholick Biſhop, α but ſhould ſend him into the Eaſt on a deputation in their name, to go to obtain of Conſtantius the reſtoration of S. Athanaſius and all the Biſhops who were perſecuted by the Arians, as it is certain they did. β And tho' Blondel and Father Petavius pretend, that notwithſtanding this reaſon, the Acts of the Council which depos'd him in the year 346 cannot be call'd in queſtion, yet it muſt be granted that this difficulty is at leaſt very conſiderable.

γ Binius endeavours to ſolve it, by ſaying that there is a miſtake in the date, and that the Council was held in 356, and not in 346; or that the two Councils have been jumbled into one, and that the date and vote of S. Maximinus belong to the firſt, and the reſt to the ſecond. [The laſt ſolution does not remove the difficulty propos'd, for it allows that Euphrates had been already condemn'd when he was ſent a deputy into the Eaſt, tho' by a ſmaller number of Biſhops. Beſides to make good what he ſuppoſes, he muſt acknowledge the beginning of the Council and from thence to the vote of Valentine to be entirely corrupted: and he might as well abſolutely give up the whole Council.

As to the other opinion, tho' it conſiſts only in changing the Conſuls, yet it has very little probability, ſince they are not read differently. And as to any one's wondring that upon the 12th of May they ſhould ſtill date by the Conſuls of the foregoing year, *poſt Conſ. Amantii & Albini*, that may ſerve for an additional vindication of the truth of it,] δ for we find by ſeveral kalendars, that this year was mark'd thus, ε tho' it had its particular Conſuls, namely Conſtantius the fourth time, and Conſtans the third, [which might proceed perhaps from Conſtantius's being at that time at the fartheſt part of the Eaſt.] Beſides, it is pretty difficult to find out the time when the Council could be held after that of Sardica, for Euphrates was at Antioch [2] at Eaſter in 348, and S. Maximinus who preſided at his condemnation,

[2] See S. Athanaſius, §. 54.

ω *Bar.* 346. § 7. | *S. B.* α *Ath. ſol. p.* 822. *a, b.* β *Blond. p.* 82. | *Pet. dog. t.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 3. §. 13. *p.* 14. γ *Conc. B. t.* 1. *p.* 571. δ *Buch. cycl. p.* 46, 240, 250, 260. ε *p.* 46. | *Idat.* | *Chr. Al. p.* 672.

was

was dead in 349, as may be ſeen under his title. And yet it is between the return of Euphrates and the death of S. Maximinus that we muſt place the fall of Euphrates into hereſy, the ſcandal which it caus'd, the loſs even of a great many people whom he made to fall after him, and the two Councils which condemn'd him. If there are any who are not frightned at theſe difficulties, they muſt ſay that Euphrates being return'd an heretick out of the Eaſt, whither he had been ſent in the name of the whole Catholick Church, and where he had become acquainted by his own experience with the wickedneſs and malice of the Arians, he declar'd himſelf ſo openly at firſt, that he oblig'd the Biſhops to depoſe him, that he met with S. Athanaſius, when this Saint came into France in the year 349, to take leave of Conſtans in order to return to Alexandria, and that laſtly he was depos'd by the Council of Cologn upon the 12th of May 349. This is not very eaſy to believe; and I think it is leſs ſo to ſee how S. Servatius could have the opportunity of oppoſing him often, by reaſon of his city being near his own. ζ Bollandus maintains, that it is the moſt abſurd thing in the world to imagine, that Euphrates fell into hereſy after his journey into the Eaſt, eſpecially if it is thought to have been immediately after. η Bucherius has embrac'd this opinion of the year 349; and to reconcile it with the date of the Conſuls, he will have it read *P. C. Amantii & Albini an. IV.* He ſhews, that ſometimes they reckon'd thus by a Conſulate which had been ſeveral years before. θ But he does not ſhew that this was ever done, when there were other Conſuls, as there had been in 348 and 349.

ι Mr. Sluſius preferrs the opinion of Sigebert, who places the Council in 375, becauſe the authors of S. Servatius's life, [among whom there is never an ancient one,] ſay that it was held about the end of this Saint's life, who according to his opinion died in 384. Baronius had rejected this, becauſe many of the Biſhops who are nam'd in the Council, were dead before that time. Mr. Sluſius owns it, and particularly of S. Maximinus who is made the Preſident of the Synod. But he anſwers, that ſince the date muſt, the names of the Biſhops may likewiſe be given up. [He muſt likewiſe give up what is ſaid *p.* 571. 2. *b*, that Euphrates maintain'd his error before S. Athanaſius and S. Servatius: And after that, I do not ſee there is any difficulty to give up all the reſt. It is not even eaſy to think, that Euphrates] κ who was an old man in 348, [ſhould live till 375.

It would be eaſy to get clear of this difficulty, by placing two Euphrates's one after another, the one condemn'd by the Council of Cologn in the year 346; and the other who being put in the place of the firſt, aſſiſted in the year 347 at the Council of Sardica, and was ſent a deputy into the Eaſt.] λ This differs very little from Bollandus's opinion. [But it is dangerous to advance things of this nature without proof. And there is indeed

ζ *Boll.* 13. *may*, *p.* 211. *b*. η *Buch. de Bel. Serv. p.* 21. θ *Slaſ. de* ι *p.* 26. κ *Ath. ſol. p.* 822. *c*. λ *Boll.* 13. *may*, *p.* 210. *c*.

but little probability, that the Council of Sardica ſhould chooſe a man who had been a Biſhop ſo little a while, for their deputy in an affair of great importance and difficulty.] μ He was at that time an old man, as we have juſt obſerv'd ; ν and the lives both of S. Severinus and S. Servatius ſay, that S. Severinus was put in the place of Euphrates depos'd, and that he was ordain'd by the ſame Council of Cologn.

Beſides this famous difficulty, it muſt be obſerv'd, that Didierius Biſhop of Langres, who ſent a proxy to this Council, did not die till the year 407, [3] when the Vandals entred Gaul. So that he muſt have been above 60 years a Biſhop. We meet with the ſame difficulty with regard to [4] S. Simplicius of Autun. Victor of Metz might likewiſe be Autor who was Biſhop of the ſame city, according to the writers of S. Servatius's life, ξ and according to ſeveral manuſcripts, when it was burnt in 451 by Attila. This is the opinion of Mr. Meuriſſe in his hiſtory of the Biſhops of Metz; and upon this he maintains, that this Autor liv'd in 346, and not in 451. ο Dyſcolius of Reims is not to be met with in Flodoard who wrote the hiſtory of that Church, nor in any other record. It is added, that without him the number of thoſe who muſt have govern'd before S. Remi, is complete. What is certain, is that thoſe who make him Biſhop of that place, have no authority for it but that of the Council of Cologn. π Mr. Sluſius even thinks, that the ſubſcriptions to this Council agreeing with thoſe to the Council of Sardica, is a ſign that they were copied from this laſt Council. ρ Father Sirmondus met with no manuſcript of the Synod of Cologn, [and I do not think it is mention'd in any hiſtory before the VIII. century, ſince which time it has been famous, tho' it does not appear to have been known to Flodoard.

People may make what conjectures they pleaſe upon all theſe things: But I am of opinion, that the leaſt that can be ſaid of the Council of Cologn, as we have it, is that it is a piece upon which nothing can be founded with certainty.] σ Father Alexander abſolutely rejects it.

[3] See Honorius, §. 24.

[4] See his hiſtory.

NOTE XXXVIII. referr'd to in §. 41. p. 128.

The time of S. Lucius of Adrianople's death.

τ SOcrates and Sozomen ſay, that S. Lucius of Adrianople died in priſon; which ſeems to be nothing but an explication, and perhaps not a neceſſary one, of what S. Athanaſius ſays, υ that he died after having been laid in chains. Φ The ſame

μ 6. ν *Conc. t. 2. p. 618.* | *Sur. 23. oct.* ξ *Meuriſſe, p. 43.* ο *Flod. l. 1. c. 5. p. 22.* | *Marlot. l. 1. c. 27. p. 95.* π *Sluſ. de Serv. p. 27.* ρ *Conc. t. 2. p. 622. d.* σ *Alex. t. 7. p. 289.* τ *Socr. l. 2. c. 26. p. 117. a.* | *Soz. l. 4. c. 2. p. 539. a.* υ *Ath. de fug. p. 703. a.* | *Sol. p. 821. a.* Φ *Socr. p. 117. a.* | *Soz. p. 539. a.*

hiſto-

hiſtorians do not place his death till after that of Conſtans. If we could follow them in this, we ſhould not think ourſelves oblig'd to ſay, that this Saint being driven a ſecond time from his ſee about the year 340, was reſtor'd before the year 348. [But we do not think their authority is ſtrong enough, to hinder us from following the order of S. Athanaſius,] χ who relates the death of this Saint with the laſt perſecution of S. Olympius and S. Theodulus, and with many other things of the ſame nature, as the effects of the rage which the Euſebians had conceiv'd for having been condemn'd by the Council of Sardica, ψ and as happening before the accident of Euphrates, [that is at the end of 347, or the beginning of 348. This is what Baronius has follow'd, who places all theſe things in 348.] ω Bollandus places likewiſe the death of S. Lucius in the ſame year.

NOTE XXXIX. referr'd to in §. 41. p. 129.

Why we place a Council at Milan in the year 347.

[WHat obliges us to place a Council at Milan in 347, is] α S. Hilary's ſaying that two years before Urſacius and Valens ask'd pardon of Pope Julius, *ante biennium*, [which was done in 349,] Photinus had been condemn'd as an heretick in the ſynod of Milan. β Some pretend, that *ante biennium* ſignifies *three years before*, and upon that place this Council of Milan in 346. [We do not ſee any thing that would hinder us from following them, if their obſervation was true, provided that they did not aſcribe to this Council what belongs to that 1 of the year 345. But I do not think, that *ante biennium* ſignifies any thing, in the ordinary uſe of the word, but *two years before*.] γ Father Sirmondus in a manuſcript diſſertation againſt Father Petavius, asks what reaſon there could be for a Council to meet at Milan ſo ſoon after that of Sardica. [It is perhaps pretty difficult to find out the reaſon, and ſignifies nothing to ſearch for it. As long as we can prove by S. Hilary that this Council was held, that is enough to make us believe it was not held without reaſon. S. Hilary however does not determine whether it was held before or after the Council of Sardica; but it ſeems to me that as there was expectation of this great Council, all the affairs that came upon the board ſhould be referr'd thither, without foreſtalling its judgment by Councils of leſs authority: Whereas if that of Sardica had without a particular examination ratified the condemnation of Photinus paſs'd in ſome other Council, as Sulpitius Severus writes *l.* 2. *p.* 155, it is not at all wonderful that this heretick, who depended mightily upon his eloquence, ſhould

1 See Note 36.

χ *Ath. ſol. p.* 821. *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 23, 24. ψ *p.* 822. *a.* β *Socr. n. p.* 25. 1. *b.* ω *Boll.* 11. *feb. p.* 519. *c.* γ *MS.*

complain that he was condemn'd without being heard, and ſhould deſire an aſſembly in which to defend or explain his opinion.] Beſides, ſince Urſacius and Valens made their ſubmiſſion in the Council of Milan, [there is all the reaſon in the world to believe they did this to ſtop the effect of the ſentence pronounc'd againſt them at Sardica; and this is likewiſe a ſtrong proof againſt thoſe who place this Council of Milan in the year 346.]

NOTE XL. referr'd to in §. 41. p. 129.

That Photinus was not depos'd in the Council of Sardica.

[WE do not find in any of the records that remain of the Council of Sardica, that any thing was done there concerning Photinus. Neither does S. Athanaſius ſay there was. And yet it is difficult to think he was not mention'd, when Sirmium was ſo near Sardica, and the Euſebians had already treated Photinus as an heretick before the Council was held. This would induce us to receive what Sulpitius Severus ſays,] [d] who ſuppoſing he had been condemn'd before, ſays that the Council of Sardica left this condemnation as they found it, becauſe the Catholicks themſelves look'd upon him as rightly condemn'd.

[e] S. Epiphanius likewiſe aſſures us, that this affair was treated of in the Weſtern Council of Sardica, that Photinus was cited thither by the Biſhops to give an account of the falſe doctrine which was laid to his charge, that he defended himſelf there as well as he could, and that he was depos'd there upon the account of his blaſphemies. [But if this was true, and Photinus's affair had made ſo great a noiſe at Sardica, we ſhould find ſomething of it in the monuments of hiſtory. So that this ſilence of all the Acts of the Council and the moſt faithful hiſtorians, join'd to the other miſtakes of the ſame author, ſeems enough to make his relation ſuſpicious, and to confirm the opinion of Baronius, 347. §. 49, who thinks this is a miſtake in this Saint, and likewiſe rejects what Sulpitius Severus ſays, whoſe hiſtory is very much perplex'd and embarraſs'd in this place. Beſides, the Council of Milan where Photinus's affair was diſcuſs'd the ſame year with the Council of Sardica, may make us imagine with probability enough that it was ſpoken of but little or not at all at Sardica, and hinders us from thinking it ſtrange that S. Epiphanius ſhould confound two Councils of the Weſt together which were held almoſt at the ſame time. This is what appears moſt probable in this point.]

[d] *Sulp. l. 2. p. 155.* [e] *Epi. 71. c. 1. 829. a, b.*

NOTE

NOTE XLI. referr'd to in §. 46. p. 143.

That the Council of Sirmium gainſt Photinus was held in the year 351.

ζ SOcrates makes a great confuſion in hiſtory about what paſs'd at Sirmium, by joining the condemnation of Photinus, which he places in the year 351, with ſeveral things that relate particularly to the fall of Hoſius, which it is certain did not happen till 357. And there is no occaſion for any other proof to ſhew clearly that he is perplex'd, than his pretending that the Council againſt Photinus in the year 351 was preceded by the baniſhment of Hoſius, η tho' Conſtantius had no power in the year 351 either over Hoſius or in Spain. θ He adds, that George aſſiſted at the ſame Council as Biſhop of Alexandria; [which he was not till 356.

Neither can it be pretended, that all that he ſays of the Council of Sirmium, did not happen till 357, as Baronius will have it.] ι For 1*ſt*, the Conſuls of that year mention'd by Socrates, κ who is never miſtaken in that, ſays Father Petavius, [are a proof of the contrary.] λ 2*dly*, The Council which depos'd Photinus, was compos'd of Eaſtern Biſhops, as S. Hilary tells us: μ And it is a ſtrong proof that it was held in the year 351, when Conſtantius was in poſſeſſion of no part of the Weſt but Illyricum, and not in 357, as Baronius will have it; for Conſtantius being then maſter of all the Empire, the Biſhops of the Weſt would have had as much or more to do at this Council than thoſe of the Eaſt. ν 3*dly*, Baſil of Ancyra, who ſeems to have been the ſoul of the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus, was ſo far from drawing up or from conſenting to the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium, which Socrates joins with the firſt, ξ that he oppos'd it immediately in the Council of Ancyra, where he even declares very clearly that this ſecond confeſſion was not drawn up at the time of Photinus's being depos'd.

[As to Father Sirmondus's pretending to diſtinguiſh between two Councils of Sirmium held at the ſame time, and the one oppoſite to the other, it is an opinion more incredible than new. It is as little authoriz'd, as the double Council of Sardica is indubitably atteſted by the original pieces which remain, and by the teſtimonies of the moſt authentick authors. However this happen'd only becauſe each party was ſupported by an Emperor, which was not the caſe in 357. 4*thly*, Germinius, who no body ſays was a Biſhop before the depoſition of Photinus,] ο held

ζ *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 30. *p.* 121, *&c.* η *n. p.* 29. I. *c.* θ *c.* 29. *p.* 121. *b.* ι *b.* κ *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 733. *c.* λ *Hil. ſyn. p.* 129. *d. c.* | 130. *b.* μ *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 736. *b, c.* ν *p.* 734. *e.* | *Epi. n. p.* 311. ξ *Epi.* 73. *c.* 2. *p.* 846. ο *Bar.* 355. §. 6.

that

that character in the year 355 at the Council of Milan. π Theodorus of Heraclea was dead, when Conſtantius made Liberius come to Milan, [that is in 355]; ρ and yet he is one of the authors of the firſt confeſſion of Sirmium drawn up againſt Photinus.

This point is treated more at large by Father Petavius in his notes upon S. Epiphanius, *p.* 310, *&c.* and in his diſſertation upon Photinus, inſerted in the ſecond tome of the laſt Councils *p.* 729. [Father Sirmondus pretended to oppoſe it in two diſſertations; but they are very weak:] σ and Valeſius ſays he muſt have ſeen the weakneſs of them himſelf, ſince he did not let them be printed.

[We do not urge what ſome alledge, that Thalaſſius who was preſent at Baſil's diſpute with Photinus, was dead [1] at the end of 353. This reaſon proves nothing; becauſe there may have been many Thalaſſius's, and indeed there was one in 357, according to a law dated that year, and we ſee no ground to conteſt the date of it: for the miſtake which Father Sirmondus finds in it, is none at all.]

[1] See Conſtantius, Note 25.

NOTE XLII. referr'd to in §. 50. p. 155.

That S. Paulinus of Treves was baniſh'd in the year 353.

"S. Athanaſius always joins S. Paulinus of Treves with thoſe who were baniſh'd [in the year 355] in the Council of Milan. [But the authority of S. Hilary, of S. Jerom's chronicle, and Sulpitius Severus, makes us ſay that he was baniſh'd before them at the time of the Council of Arles.]

NOTE XLIII. referr'd to in §. 50. p. 155.

That Rhodanus of Toulouſe was not baniſh'd ſo ſoon as S. Paulinus of Treves: What is ſaid of the firſt Biſhops of Mentz, does not deſerve any belief.

[S. Jerom in his chronicle gives S. Paulinus Rhodanus of Toulouſe for a companion in his baniſhment; which proceeds perhaps] υ from this that they both died in Phrygia Φ For S.

π *Theodrt. l.* 2. *c.* 13. *p.* 607. *d.* ρ *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 48, 49. σ *Socr. l.* 2. *p.* 129. 1. *a.* τ *Ath. ſol. p.* 831, *b*, *c.* | 836. *d.* υ *Sulp l.* 2. *p.* 169, 170. Φ *p.* 160.

Sulpi-

Sulpitius, who is more to be credited in this, assures us that Rhodanus did not suffer till some years after [1] with S. Hilary.

[1] See S. Hilary of Poictiers, Note 4.

χ Notwithstanding this, Baronius says, that he was banish'd with S. Paulinus and one Lucius Annæus Bishop of Mentz; but he says this upon the authority of the life of S. Maximus Annæus's successor: And this life has no body for its author but Trithemius, or one Megenfroy a Monk of Fuld in the time of the Otho's. [It is all over full of mistakes and stories, and it cannot be made to agree with itself. There is nothing good in this life, but] ψ that we find by it that Megenfroy is the most ancient author of what is palm'd upon us concerning the first Bishops of Mentz, and that whereas he reckons forty of them down to S. Boniface, others place but sixteen: That this Maximus whom he reckons the nineteenth, and places in Constantius's reign, is plac'd by others after Attila, and reckon'd the seventh. He speaks likewise of the deposition of Euphrates of Cologn, pretty differently from what we have of it in the Councils; but I do not think this can signify any thing towards removing the difficulty. Serrarius in his annals of Mentz *p.* 240,---250, has nothing to tell us of S. Maximus, but what he learnt from Trithemius. He does not so much as say that any honour is paid him at this day. The little that he says of Lucius Annæus *p.* 240, makes us certain that nothing at all is known about him.

NOTE XLIV. referr'd to in §. 51. p. 159.

That there were none but the Confessors, who were faithful to truth in the Council of Milan.

ω THeodorit says, that the Bishops of the Council of Milan would neither condemn S. Athanasius, nor admit of a new confession; but it is plain that he means it only of three or four who by their couragious resistance were thought worthy of being depos'd and banish'd. α Sozomen explains himself likewise to this sense, for he says that those who oppos'd the condemnation of S. Athanasius, were banish'd: β And he is still more expres in another place.

χ *Bar.* 353. §. 22. ψ *Sur.* 18. *nov.* *p.* 402. §. 4. ω *Thdrt.* *l.* 2. *c.* 12. *p.* 605. *a*, *b*. α *Soz.* *l.* 4. *c.* 11. *p.* 551. *b*. β *c.* 9. *p.* 547. *a*, *b*.

NOTE

NOTE XLV. referr'd to in §. 58. p. 186.

That we muſt diſtinguiſh between two towns of Berea, one in Macedonia, the other in Thrace whither Liberius was baniſh'd.

γ UPon what Theodorit and Sozomen ſay, that Pope Liberius was baniſh'd to Berea in Thrace, δ Blondel is in doubt whether Thrace was not taken for Macedonia, where there was a town of Berea pretty famous, or whether there was another in Macedonia, of which we have little knowledge. ε But Ammianus aſſures us, that there was a town of Berea very conſiderable in Thrace properly ſo called. [And we muſt diſtinguiſh between theſe two Berea's, if it is true that] ζ Gerontius call'd Biſhop of Brevi in Macedonia, who aſſiſted with the Catholicks at the Council of Sardica, η was Biſhop of Berea, as others read it. θ For Demophilus the Arian, who is without doubt him of Berea, was Biſhop as early as the year 345 at leaſt. [It is he without doubt] ι who in the ſubſcriptions to the Mock-Council of Sardica, is called *Demofilus ab Cooe*, [for *à Beræa*, of Berea,] κ whither Liberius was baniſh'd.

NOTE XLVI. referr'd to in §. 58. p. 187.

A falſe hiſtory of the intruſion of Felix into Liberius's place.

λ WE have found in a manuſcript an hiſtory of Felix who intruded into Liberius's place, where we read that he was ordain'd in an aſſembly of Biſhops, where all the Clergy of Rome was preſent. [This is not eaſy to reconcile with S. Athanaſius,] μ who informs us that his ordination was perform'd in the palace by three wretched Biſhops, in the preſence perhaps of three eunuchs who repreſented the people, becauſe all the people expreſs'd nothing but horror at this action, and would not ſuffer theſe ſchiſmaticks to enter the Churches. ν The ſame hiſtory ſays, that Felix was a Prieſt; [whereas] ξ Rufinus aſſures us, after Marcellinus the Prieſt *pag.* 3. that he was only a Dea-

γ *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 13, 14. *p.* 609, 610. *a.* | *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 11. *p.* 551. *c.* | 552. *b*, *c.* δ *Blond. prim. p.* 496. ε *Amm. l.* 27. *p.* 329. ζ *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 20. η *Conc. B. t.* 1. *p.* 540. 1. *d.* θ *Hil. fr.* 2. *p.* 41. | *Blond. prim. p.* 481. ι *Hil. fr.* 2. *p.* 32. κ *Blond. prim. p.* 481. λ *MS. p.* 218. μ *Ath. ſol. p.* 861. *b*, *c.* ν *MS. p.* 218. ξ *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 22. *p.* 247.

con-

con. [This is enough for us to judge of this piece, without mentioning the other miſtakes which are in it in very great numbers. It begins with theſe words: *Fuit in diebus Conſtantii filii, &c.*]

NOTE XLVII. referr'd to in §. 58. p. 188.

That there are no ſolid proofs of Damaſus's having communicated with the Antipope Felix.

ᵒ BAronius pretends that Damaſus, who was afterwards Pope, left Liberius's communion and join'd that of Felix; which he could not do without perjury, according to S. Jerom's chronicle and Marcellinus the Prieſt *pag.* 3. [Neither do we ſee that this fact has any real foundation; and Baronius does not appear to have had any other proofs but the preface of Marcellinus the Prieſt, who declaring himſelf for Urſinus againſt Damaſus,] ᵠ appears to have been willing to make people believe that he follow'd Felix contrary to his oath, but he does not ſay it clearly: [Which is enough at leaſt to give ground to doubt it. And S. Jerom would not in all likelihood have dar'd to call thoſe perſons perjur'd wretches who had quitted Liberius, if Damaſus, whoſe particular friend he was, had been one of the number.] ᵖ Bollandus's Pontifical ſays, that after Felix was beheaded, it was Damaſus the Prieſt who came by night and took away his body to bury it. [But I do not think that any greater ſtreſs can be laid upon this Pontifical than upon the others, and it is too full of miſtakes to believe it belongs even to the VI. century, as Bollandus would have it.]

NOTE XLVIII. referr'd to in §. 59. p. 189.

That what the life of S. Parthenius ſays of the avarice and death of the Biſhop of Heraclea, relates to Theodorus: The time of his death.

ᵗ WHAT we ſay here of the avarice and death of Theodorus of Heraclea, taken out of the life of Parthenius, is in that life aſcrib'd to Hypatian Biſhop of the ſame city, whoſe ſucceſſor however it makes to have been one of that name. ᵘ But this is only the reading of the Latin tranſlation of Gentianus Hervetus. The Greek text gives the name of Hypatian

ᵒ *Bar.* 357. §. 60. | 367. §. 8. ᵠ *Mar. & F. p.* 3, 5. ᵖ *Boll. apr. t.* 1. *p.* 31. *e.* ᵗ *Boll.* 7. *feb. p.* 39. *f.* ᵘ *p.* 43. *a.* | 38. *c.*

only

only to the ſecond, without naming his predeceſſor, whoſe death is related in that life. [Nor does any one ſay, there were two Hypatians ſucceſſively in the ſee of Heraclea. Therefore we have made no difficulty to referr to Theodorus what is ſaid of Hypatian's predeceſſor; for we do not find that there was any Biſhop of Heraclea between thoſe two, and indeed it would be difficult to place one between them,] υ ſeeing that Theodorus was ſtill living in 351, φ and that Hypatianus was Biſhop as early as that year.

χ Valeſius pretends, that Theodorus was living even in the year 356, becauſe S. Athanaſius ſpeaks of him in a piece written that year. But S. Athanaſius does not ſay in that place, that he was ſtill living, as he does of ſome others, and he places him next after Stephen [depos'd from the ſee of Antioch in the year 348. So that this need not hinder us from believing,] ψ that he was dead in the year 355, as Liberius aſſures us.

NOTE XLIX. referr'd to in §. 60. p. 193.

That what Marcellinus and Fauſtinus ſay of S. Maximus of Naples and S. Rufinian, ſhould not be rejected: The time of S. Maximus's baniſhment.

1 WE find nothing of the hiſtory of S. Maximus of Naples, but in the petition of Marcellinus and Fauſtinus Luciferian Prieſts, *p.* 29, which need occaſion no ſcruple concerning his faith and his holineſs, ſince as he died in exile, and therefore before Conſtantius, he could not ſee the beginning of the Luciferian ſchiſm.

For the ſame reaſon we don't think we can make any difficulty of crediting what thoſe Prieſts ſay concerning S. Rufinian *p.* 30. They do not ſay whether this Saint was a Biſhop, tho' there is ſome ground to preſume it, becauſe the perſecution at that time particularly affected the Biſhops; and the whole tenour of what Marcellinus writes, induces us to believe, that 'tis only of Biſhops he means to ſpeak in all this paſſage. Seeing that S. Rufinian ſhed his blood at Naples, this makes it probable that he exerciſed that dignity in Campania.] ω Baronius ſtyles him Biſhop.

α He places his martyrdom and the confeſſion of S. Maximus in the perſecution which he pretends follow'd the Council of Ariminum in the year 360, [but he brings no proof of it; nor indeed do we ſee any, unleſs perhaps becauſe Marcellinus and

υ *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 48, 49. φ *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 29. *p.* 121. *b.* χ *n.* *p.* 29. 1. *c, d.* | *Ath. in Ar. or.* 1. *p.* 290. *a.* ψ *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 12. *p.* 607. *d.* ω *Bar.* 359. §. 63. α §. 63.

Fauſtinus

Fauſtinus ſay nothing of it, till after the mention of S. Hilary, who was not baniſh'd till the year 356. On the other ſide, S. Maximus having died in his exile, that is before the year 362, this is rendred more credible by placing his exile in the year 355 or 356, than by deferring it to the year 360.]

NOTE L. referr'd to in §. 62. p. 200.

That Marathonius was not in all likelihood made Biſhop of Nicomedia till Julian's reign.

βSOcrates ſpeaking in general of the violence of the Arians before the Council of Seleucia held in the year 359, ſays that Macedonius had then made Marathonius Biſhop of Nicomedia. γ Sozomen ſays that he had made him ſo even before that time. [If theſe authors are not entirely miſtaken, it muſt be ſaid that Marathonius was choſen into the place of Cecrops, who died the 24th of Auguſt 358. But it muſt alſo be ſaid, that he was depos'd with Macedonius by the Council of Conſtantinople in the year 360. For according to the ſame hiſtorians he was always from the time of that Council very cloſely united to Macedonius. However we find nothing in any author to prove Marathonius's depoſition, only that] δ Philoſtorgius ſays, that Oneſimus was made Biſhop of Nicomedia by Acacius in 360, after the Council of Conſtantinople, but he ſays that this was in the room of Cecrops, [without mentioning Marathonius. Since therefore no author ſays that Marathonius was depos'd in the year 360 with Macedonius, tho' thoſe who were depos'd at that time are mention'd particularly, and ſince Marathonius who was conſiderable both for his perſon and his ſee, ought not to have been forgot; there is likelihood enough, that he was not made Biſhop till Julian's reign, in the new party which Macedonius form'd after his depoſition. S. Hilary ſpeaks of Eleuſius in the year 258 without any mention of Marathonius.]

NOTE LI. referr'd to in §. 65. p. 212.

That the promotion of Aëtius to the Diaconate did not occaſion the breach of communion between the Catholicks and the Arians of Antioch.

εPHiloſtorgius ſays that till the promotion of Aëtius to the order of Deacon, [about the year 350,] the defenders of the Con-

β *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 38. *p.* 141, 142. γ *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 20. *p.* 570. *b, c.*
δ *Phiſg. l.* 5. *c.* 1. *p.* 77. ε *Phiſg. l.* 3. *c.* 14. *p.* 47.

ſubſtan-

ſubſtantiality and the Arians communicated with each other in the prayers, the hymns, and almoſt in all things, except in the ſacrifice: But that after Aëtius came to Antioch, all the bonds of friendſhip and ſociety were entirely broken. [This does not agree with the beſt hiſtorians, who tell us that one part of the Catholicks never own'd any of the Biſhops who intruded into the place of S. Euſtathius, which made them be call'd Euſtathians; and that the reſt of the Catholicks who own'd them, never brake communion but with S. Meletius in the year 361.]

NOTE LII. referr'd to in §. 66. p. 218.

That all perſons have read ὁμοούσιον in the Nicene Creed, and no body ὁμοιούσιον.

ζ SUlpitius Severus ſays, that the Arians [or rather the Semiarians] to make the Council of Nice on their ſide, had corrupted it by adding one letter to the Creed, and pretending that the word there was not ὁμοούσιον, but ὁμοιούσιον, becauſe it was their opinion, that the eſſence and nature of the Son was like to that of the Father, but not that it was the ſame. [But if they had thus chang'd the text in ſome copies, they could not have done it in all: Nor was it upon that they grounded their opinion:] η for S. Athanaſius ſays that they rejected the Council of Nice, and that it was only becauſe of the word ὁμοούσιον. [I do not find that it was ever diſputed how the word ſhould be read in the Nicene Creed, but whether ὁμοούσιον, which was ſuppos'd to be the word, was conformable to the truth, or in what ſenſe it was to be taken.]

NOTE LIII. referr'd to in §. 69. p. 228.

Upon Liberius's letter to Urſacius, &c.

θ LIberius's letter to Urſacius, &c. which we have in the firſt fragments of S. Hilary, *p.* 49. of Pithæus's edition, has this paſſage: *Cognoſcat itaque prudentia veſtra Athanaſium ..... priuſquam ad comitatum ſancti Imperatoris ſecundum litteras Orientalium Epiſcoporum, & ab Eccleſiæ Romanæ communione ſeparatus eſt, ſicuti teſte eſt omne Presbyterium Romanæ Eccleſiæ.* Theſe words make no ſenſe, yet there would be ſome ſenſe in them, if after *ſancti Imperatoris* were added *litteras dirigerem*, or ſomething like it. It is evident from the preceding Letter, *p.* 48, that Liberius had written to Conſtantius to condemn S. Athanaſius. *A mea* ought likewiſe to be added before *& ab Eccleſiæ Romanæ, &c.*

ζ *Sulp. l.* 2. *p.* 161. η *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 915.

But

But the new edition of S. Hilary explains this paſſage by another reading, which the Benedictins have found in a manuſcript, and which makes the ſame ſenſe with that we look for in Pithæus's edition. It is this:] θ *Cognoſcat itaque prudentia veſtra Athanaſium - - - à me eſſe damnatum, priuſquam ad Comitatum Sancti Imperatoris litteras Orientalium deſtinarem Epiſcoporum, & ab Eccleſiæ Romanæ communione eſſe ſeparatum, ſicuti teſte eſt*, &c. [It appears from this reading, that Liberius had received a letter from the Eaſtern Biſhops, to whom he had probably firſt writ,] and that he had ſent it to Court [to procure his reſtoration by this proof of his Communion with them.

Theſe laſt words, *ſicuti teſte eſt*, &c. give us occaſion to ſay, that he had alſo writ to the Clergy of Rome upon the condemnation of S. Athanaſius: for I can ſee no poſſibility of referring theſe words to what had paſs'd five years before in the beginning of Liberius's Pontificate,] ι as Baronius would have it.

NOTE LIV. referr'd to in §. 69. p. 229.

Upon the Anathema's againſt Liberius, inſerted in his letter, which S. Hilary has given us: A miſtake of Gulielmus de S. Amore.

κ THE epiſtle of Liberius to the Eaſtern Biſhops, in which he declares himſelf againſt S. Athanaſius, &c. is found in the fragments of S. Hilary: and 'tis there interrupted by theſe words, *Hæc eſt perfida Ariana; hoc ego notavi, non apoſtata. - - - - - Anathema tibi à me dictum Liberi & ſocijs tuis - - - - - Iterum tibi anathema & tertio, prævaricator Liberi.* Baronius pretends 357. §. 49, that theſe Anathema's are not S. Hilary's, but ſome inſolent tranſcriber's. [The beſt reaſon that can be alledg'd for it is, that Liberius had already made amends for that fault by the oppoſition he made to the Council of Ariminum, when S. Hilary wrote that book, of which we have the fragments.] λ Blondel anſwers to this, that it is neither ſtrange nor without example, that S. Hilary tranſcribing ſo baſe and unworthy a letter, could not forbear ſaying what judgment he made of it, with regard to Liberius's diſpoſition at the time he writ it, not to that he ſhew'd afterwards.

μ Mr. du Perron, who makes the ſame difficulty with Baronius, does himſelf reſolve it in another manner. For he ſays, that S. Hilary may have inſerted theſe Parentheſes in Liberius's epiſtle before he tranſcrib'd his copy, and that when he did that, having left vacant ſpaces to inſert the paſſages he cited, thoſe who tranſcrib'd it put in the paſſages as they found them among his papers.

θ *Hil. B. p.* 1338, 1339. ι *Bar.* 357. §. 35, 36. κ *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 48. λ *Blond. prim. p.* 487, 490. μ *p.* 490.

[To ſhew how little was known of hiſtory in the thirteenth century, we may obſerve what I remember to have read in Gulielmus de S. Amore, who was certainly one of the beſt hiſtorians of that time.] ν He had ſome knowledge, that in S. Hilary's days, a Pope had conſented to hereſy with the greateſt part of the Biſhops. He knew not who the Pope was, but he ſays by way of conjecture, that it might be Anaſtaſius II, [who is known to have died in the year 498, near a hundred and fifty years after S. Hilary.]

NOTE LV. referr'd to in §. 69. p. 230.

Which confeſſion of Sirmium it was that Liberius ſign'd.

[IT is no ſmall difficulty to know, whether Liberius ſign'd the firſt or the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium. The time in which he ſign'd, ſeems to perſuade us that it was the ſecond, which was juſt made. To which may be added the manner in which S. Hilary ſpeaks of it,] ξ who ſays, that Liberius approv'd of the Arian perfidy, which certainly agrees very well with the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium, whereas in all the book of the Synods he receives the firſt as Catholick. ['Tis this without doubt that made] ο Blondel ſay, as a thing indubitable, that he ſign'd the ſecond; π and Father Petavius ſays the ſame, that if he ſign'd any (of which there can be no doubt, after what Liberius himſelf ſays of it) it muſt have been the ſecond.

[The judgment of theſe two learned men adds great confirmation to an opinion, which of itſelf is very probable. And if they have not ſtay'd much to conſider the reaſons with which Baronius endeavours to maintain the contrary opinion, 'tis becauſe they are very weak. But another objection may be made againſt them, to which it were to be wiſh'd they had anſwer'd a little more carefully. It is,] ρ that S. Hilary ſays, that the Sirmian perfidy ſign'd by Liberius was drawn up by twenty two Biſhops, whom he afterwards names. [Now it is not poſſible to make good that theſe twenty two Biſhops made the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium; for it is not thought that there were many Biſhops at this, beſides Urſacius, Valens, and Germinius:] σ and if the Greek tranſlation of this confeſſion reads, *and the others*, τ the Latin original of S. Hilary ſays nothing of it, υ and the Council of the Anomœans at Antioch return'd thanks only to thoſe three

[But whatever Biſhops were there, Baſil of Ancyra certainly was not,] φ who ſome months after declaim'd in his Council

ν *Guil. Reſp. ad obj. p.* 96. ξ *Hil. fr.* 2. *p.* 48. ο *Blond. prim. p.* 480, 484. π *Epi. n. p.* 316. ρ *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 48, 49. *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 902. *d.* τ *Hil. de ſyn. p.* 125. 1. *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 12. *p.* 554. *b.* φ *Epi.* 73. *c.* 2. *p. a, b.*

againſt

againſt this confeſſion. χ Neither was Theodorus [of Heraclea] there, for he died before the baniſhment of Liberius, [in the year 355 at the lateſt. It is not thought that even Eudoxius of Germanicia could be preſent there; tho' that be not altogether certain. It is alſo very difficult to believe it of Silvanus of Tarſus, who rather paſs'd for a Catholick than one that was capable of ſigning the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium. We muſt alſo reject out of that number Cecrops of Nicomedia, Macedodonius, whether he were of Conſtantinople or of Mopſueſtia, and Mark of Arethuſa, who were of the Eaſt,] ψ ſince the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium was made by thoſe of the Weſt; [and on the contrary Germinius of Sirmium himſelf, who was certainly at the ſecond and not at the firſt, is not to be found among theſe twenty two Prelates, without mentioning Hoſius and Potamus, who at leaſt had ſign'd it. It is therefore very difficult or abſolutely impoſſible to doubt, that theſe ſubſcriptions were not thoſe to the firſt confeſſion of Sirmium, and that therefore it was not that neither which Liberius was made to ſign.

To this reaſon might be added the authority of Sozomen, if that could be of any great weight,] ω ſince he relates, that when the epiſtle of Hoſius was receiv'd in the Eaſt, [that is the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium, or ſome other writing of the ſame nature,] Eudoxius and thoſe of his party caus'd a rumour to be ſpread, that Liberius had rejected the Conſubſtantiality, and embrac'd the ἀνόμοιον. [Which had not been a falſe report, as Sozomen would have it thought, occaſion'd by confounding the two confeſſions of Sirmium, but a fact very well grounded, if he had ſign'd the ſecond of thoſe confeſſions, ſeeing that confeſſion did formally reject the Conſubſtantiality, and eſtabliſh the ἀνόμοιον.

Father Petavius's anſwer to this objection is a little ſtrange:] α for he owns that all the Biſhops we have nam'd, could not be at the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium: but he ſays, that this paſſage is not S. Hilary's, but ſome ignorant writer's who knew not the diviſions of the Arians. [He had better own, that this difficulty will admit of no ſolution: for what may be ſaid farther, that S. Hilary confounded the two confeſſions of Sirmium, and took the ſubſcriptions to the firſt for thoſe to the ſecond, is not much more probable.

After all, I ſee nothing that abſolutely hinders a little alleviating Liberius's fault, and ſaying that he ſign'd only the firſt confeſſion of Sirmium. What is more difficult herein is to reconcile S. Hilary to himſelf, and ſhew how he could ſtyle that Arian perfidy which he had before approv'd as Catholick. This were eaſy, if we would ſay with Baronius, that it is not S. Hilary that calls the confeſſion ſign'd by Liberius Arian perfidy. But not to ſtop at a conjecture that has but little probability in it, it is not ſtrange that S. Hilary at one time tolera-

χ *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 13. *p.* 607. *d.* ψ *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 12. *p.* 554. *b.* ω *c.* 15. *p.* 557, 558. α *Epi. n. p.* 317.

ted a confeſſion which in itſelf was not altogether bad, and at another gave it the name it deſerv'd, when he had regard to the authors of it, and the ill uſe of it they deſir'd to make, which was to aboliſh the Council of Nice and the doctrine of the Conſubſtantiality.] β For this reaſon S. Hilary himſelf, in his book againſt Conſtantius, condemns the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus, where this confeſſion was drawn up, as well as all the other Arian Councils: γ and S. Athanaſius puts this confeſſion alſo among the reſt. [To have ſign'd it therefore at the ſame time that he communicated with the Arians, and condemn'd S. Athanaſius, was enough to deſerve the anathema's of S. Hilary and of all the Church, and to give occaſion to S. Jerom to ſay that] δ Liberius had ſubſcrib'd to hereſy, [and to S. Hilary,] ε that he knew not whether Conſtantius had committed a greater impiety in baniſhing Liberius from Rome, or in ſending him, as he had done, back thither again.

[If this be thought a ſufficient anſwer to this firſt objection, it will ſtill be more eaſy to ſatisfy the ſecond, which is this, that Liberius having ſign'd immediately after the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium, it is to be preſum'd that he ſign'd no other but that. For firſt, we know not ſo preciſely the ſeries of all theſe matters, as to be able to aſſert that Liberius had not ſign'd before the ſecond confeſſion was brought to Berea. 2dly, Liberius might well conſent to ſign the firſt, and have ſome averſion to the ſecond. God does not always permit men to fall to the bottom of the precipice, eſpecially ſuch as he intends to raiſe from their fall, as we have grounds to believe he did Liberius. Even Demophilus and Fortunatianus might well not ask him to ſign this; and the reſt might content themſelves with leſs than they had deſir'd, ſince it was a great deal for them to have made Liberius fall ſo far; juſt as they did not oblige Hoſius to condemn S. Athanaſius. After all, if we ſhould ſay that Urſacius, Valens, and Conſtantius were not ſatisfy'd with Liberius's ſigning, this would agree very well with what Sozomen ſays, that Liberius was not ſent back to Rome, nor even recall'd from Berea, till the deputies of the Council of Ancyra had caus'd the face of affairs to be chang'd, and even thoſe to retract who had ſign'd the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium, as we ſhall ſee in the following year.

This is what we are able to ſay upon this important difficulty, concerning which it is perhaps ſafer to remain in doubt, than to aſſert any thing on either ſide.]

β *Hil. in Conſ. l.* 1. *p.* 116, 1. 2.
γ *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 900. *a.*
δ *Hier. v. ill. c.* 97. *p.* 297. *b.* | *chr.* *p.* 114, 115.
ε *Hil. in. Conſ. l.* 1.

NOTE

NOTE LVI. referr'd to in §. 70. p. 231.

The time of Eudoxius of Germanicia's ſeizing the biſhoprick of Antioch.

ζ SOcrates ſays, that Eudoxius was at Rome when he heard of the death of Leontius Biſhop of Antioch, and gives us to underſtand clearly enough, that Conſtantius was there too. [If that be ſo, Leontius muſt have died at lateſt in May 357.] η Yet S. Athanaſius in his epiſtle to thoſe that liv'd a ſolitary life ſays, that he was ſtill living; [and that was at fartheſt at the end of the year 357,] θ for in the ſame epiſtle he ſpeaks of the fall of Liberius and of the death of Hoſius.

This reaſon would be altogether deciſive, if ſome did not pretend that theſe paſſages concerning Liberius and Hoſius have been added ſince by S. Athanaſius himſelf. [I don't ſee any ground for ſaying this: but be that as it will, there is another reaſon which is not eaſily anſwer'd;] ι and that is, that Eudoxius on the news of Leontius's death, haſten'd to poſſeſs himſelf of the ſee of Antioch.] κ He afterwards ſent Aſphalius to Conſtantius, [who was then at Sirmium. It is not ſaid poſitively what Aſphalius came to do at Court; but if we conſider the whole paſſage of Sozomen, c. 13, 14, I don't think it can be doubted but that he came to ask the confirmation of Eudoxius's intruſion into the ſee of Antioch.] Aſphalius was ſtill at Sirmium, when the deputies of the Council of Ancyra arriv'd there. λ This Council was held [in the year 358] a little before Eaſter. The deputies of it who were Biſhops, [went not away doubtleſs till after Eaſter, which was the 22d of April, and ſo could not arrive at Sirmium till the middle of May. It is alſo to be obſerv'd, that Eudoxius, who had reaſon to fear the conſequence of his uſurpation, did not fail without doubt to uſe all diligence to obtain the Emperor's confirmation of it. He had the eunuchs on his ſide; nor is it ſaid, that Aſphalius found any obſtacle. If he was therefore ſtill at Sirmium in the middle of May, there is good reaſon to think that Eudoxius did not make himſelf Biſhop of Antioch but very little before. Thus the death of Leontius cannot be plac'd at ſooneſt before the end of the year 357, and if Eudoxius heard the news of it while he was at Court, that was rather at Sirmium than at Rome.] μ Sozomen only ſays, that Conſtantius was in the Weſt,

ζ *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 37. *p.* 132. *a.* η *Ath. ſol. p.* 812. *c.*
θ *p.* 847. *a.* | 841. *d.* ι *Socr. p.* 132. *a, b.* | *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 12. *p.* 553. *c.* κ *Soz. c.* 13. *p.* 555. *c.* λ *Epi.* 73. *c.* 2. *p.* 847. *b.* μ *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 12. *p.* 553. *c.*

[We can collect nothing from the eight years which Nicephorus and Theophanes give to the episcopate of Leontius, since they would only bring us to the middle of the year 356. Eutychius *p.* 476, allows him nine years, which decides nothing, seeing that a few months may be always added thereto. But the two years which all these authors give Eudoxius in the see of Antioch, induce us to think, that he was made Bishop of that city in the beginning of the year 358, because he was certainly translated to Constantinople in the beginning of 360.

If Socrates were a more considerable author, in whom there were seldom any mistakes to be found, he might be explain'd in this sense, that Eudoxius heard at Rome of Leontius's death, and went immediately to Constantius at Milan or at Sirmium to obtain his leave to go into Syria. But in all appearance this was not Socrates's meaning.]

NOTE LVII. referr'd to in §. 73. p. 245.

Whether Liberius sign'd the condemnation of the Consubstantiality in the assembly of Sirmium.

[IT is certainly very hard to believe, that Liberius was made to sign the condemnation of the Consubstantiality in the assembly of Sirmium, because Basil of Ancyra and the rest of the Semiarians who govern'd there, had themselves taken away this condemnation from the anathema's of the Council of Ancyra. S. Hilary, who in his book of the synods examines so fully into the belief of the Easterns upon this point, would not have forgot so important a circumstance, and one that would have shewn their opinion so clearly. This appears to be a sufficient ground to judge, that all that at that time could be ask'd of Liberius and the rest, amounted to no more than the suppression of the term *Consubstantial*, not to the condemnation of it. 'Tis for this reason that we have referr'd rather to the preceding year than to this,] [v] the letter in which the Easterns admitted the likeness of substance, and rejected the Consubstantiality. [It must be own'd however, that this epistle agrees much better with this year than the preceding; and it must be also observ'd,] [x] that Victorinus in his first book against the Arians, says plainly enough, that the defenders of the likeness of substance, [who are the Semiarians,] had writ into Africa that the Consubstantiality ought to be banish'd, and that with this order they had sent neither reasons nor authorities of scripture, but only an absolute command [of the Emperor, which seems to refer to this time, for we do not see that at any other time the Semiarians had interest enough at Court to obtain this sort of commands from thence. And we learn from Sozomen,] [o] that Basil of

[v] *Hil. syn. p.* 136. 1. *c.*
[x] *Bib. P. t.* 4. 1. *p.* 198. *d*, *e.*
[o] *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 24. *p.* 580. *d.*

An-

Ancyra did indeed write into Africa againſt Urſacius and Valens.

[It may therefore well be, that the Semiarians did at laſt openly declare againſt the Conſubſtantiality, whether thro' that fickleneſs which is natural to hereticks, or that they had no longer the ſame reaſons which had oblig'd them at firſt to ſuppreſs that anathema which they had ſign'd at Ancyra, or laſtly that they might not paſs for Homouſians, that is, for Catholicks, pretending thereby to gain more liberty to maintain their opinions. The epiſtle itſelf, of which we have ſpoke, may have been the cauſe of this change: for if it was Urſacius, Valens, and Germinius, who requir'd the reading of it, as S. Hilary affirms, 'tis probable enough that they did it to oblige the Semiarians to condemn the Conſubſtantiality, as they had done in that epiſtle.

But if the Semiarians did indeed condemn it, and cauſe it to be condemn'd at Sirmium, it muſt be ſtill ſaid, that S. Hilary did not know it when he wrote his book of Synods;] π and yet he did not write it, till there was a talk of aſſembling a Council at Ariminum, [that is, towards the end of this year. It were to be wiſh'd that ſome learned man had taken the pains to examine this difficulty thoroughly, and found means to reſolve it.]

NOTE LVIII. referr'd to in §. 73. p. 245.

That it was the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium, which the Arians caus'd to be ſuppreſs'd by Conſtantius's authority.

ρ S. Athanaſius ſays that it was the third confeſſion of Sirmium, made the 22d of May 359, which the Arians caus'd to be ſuppreſs'd by the authority of Conſtantius, who publi h'd an edict on purpoſe to call in all the copies of it. σ Socrates and Sozomen ſay, that it was the ſecond: [and tho' their authority is by no means to be compar'd to that of S. Athanaſius, it is yet difficult not to follow them in this point,] τ as Father Petavius has already done. [For there is little likelihood that the Arians could pretend to ſuppreſs the third confeſſion of faith of Sirmium, which they had certainly ſhewn at the Council of Ariminum, that is, to four hundred Biſhops. And whereas the ſame objection may be made againſt Socrates, it is eaſy to anſwer that Baſil of Ancyra, who doubtleſs ſolicited the ſuppreſſion of the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium, was not ſo much concern'd to ſuppreſs it, as by this formality entirely to cry it down, that

π *Hil. ſyn. p.* 124. 2. *d.* ρ *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 904. *b.*
σ *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 30. *p.* 126. *c, d.* | *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 6. *p.* 543. *b, c.*
τ *Epi. n. p.* 316.

it might never be produc'd more: which cannot be ſaid of the third, ſince that was in fact caus'd to be ſign'd by almoſt all the Biſhops, only taking the title from it, and changing ſome terms in it.]

υ Beſides, S. Athanaſius ſays, that after they had ſuppreſs'd the confeſſion of Sirmium, they drew up that of the Acacians in the Council of Seleucia: φ and this very confeſſion of the Acacians is authoriz'd by the other, and pretends to ſay nothing, but what had been taught in that. [There was then no danger of its being ſuppreſs'd at that time.]

χ This confeſſion was alſo in this Council objected againſt the Semiarians, who only anſwer'd that it no ways regarded them, and that they had nothing to do but to examine whether it was good or bad, [but they never ſaid that it had been condemn'd.

It muſt be even ſaid, that the Acacians made it a crime againſt them before the Emperor, that they had thus rejected it, if we read in] ψ Socrates ὑπ' αὐτὸν inſtead of ὑπ' αὐτῆς, [which ſeems to be a miſtake.] ω Valeſius however does not alter it, but yet he takes it in the ſame meaning, and thinks this paſſage is to be underſtood of the third confeſſion of Sirmium.

[We muſt not have recourſe to this pretence, that the Arians might ſuppreſs it after the Council of Seleucia: for S. Athanaſius ſays, that they had done it before this Council; and that they were then more powerful than ever, paſt fearing and bluſhing before any one. Nay, we ſee] α that in the year 366, Valens deſiring to reduce Germinius to pure Arianiſm, alledges only the formulary of Ariminum, without ſpeaking of the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium, β tho' both of them had ſign'd it, or rather had compos'd it, γ and Germinius on the contrary in his anſwer to Valens inſiſts wholly on the third dated the 22d of May. [This is a clear proof that the former was ſuppreſs'd, and that the latter was not.]

NOTE LIX. referr'd to in §. 75. p. 251.

Upon S. Euſebius Prieſt of Rome, and his acts.

δ IN S. Jerom's martyrologies one S. Euſebius is ſet down upon the 14th of Auguſt as a Martyr, but with ſo much confuſion that one cannot tell who it is: ε and Florentinius chooſes rather to believe that it is a Martyr of Syria, a different man from the Prieſt of Rome who is honour'd at preſent upon the ſame day

υ *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 904. *b.* φ *p.* 905. *b.* χ *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 22. *p.* 576. *b.* ψ *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 41. *p.* 153. *b.* ω *n. p.* 37. 1. *b.* α *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 40. β *ſyn. p.* 125. 1. *c.* γ *fr. p.* 44. δ *Flor. p.* 732. ε *p.* 754.

as

as a Confeſſor. ζ S. Gregory's Sacramentary places upon that day *natale Sancti Euſebii Sacerdotis*, [a term which according to ancient uſage, ſignifies rather a Biſhop than a Prieſt.] He is call'd Confeſſor in the prayers; η and Father Menardus ſays, that he is call'd ſo as S. Felix of Nola was, *quia multis tormentis pro fide orthodoxa toleratis ſuperſtes fuit.* [He ſeems to have intended to point out by this ſome Euſebius diſtinct from the Prieſt, who it is not ſaid ſuffer'd any other puniſhment than being in priſon for ſeven months, in which he died.] θ Father Fronto ſays, that Euſebius who was honour'd upon the 24th of Auguſt, had a title of his name at Rome, ι and that this title is of S. Euſebius Pontiff and Martyr. [He ſeems therefore to have believ'd, that this is S. Euſebius the Pope who died in 310,] κ of whom we read indeed that he died the 17th of Auguſt, XVI. Kal. Sept. [and it may eaſily be imagin'd that inſtead of XVI. it ought to be XIX. But ſince] λ Baronius ſays, that to this day they keep in this church the body of S. Euſebius the Prieſt, and that of S. Oroſius, [who they ſay buried him, it is highly probable that this is he whoſe name this Church bears.] Bede in his martyrology gives him on the 14th of Auguſt the title of Prieſt. Uſuardus obſerves ſtill more particularly, that he ſuffer'd in the time of Conſtantius; and this is the opinion that has been follow'd ever ſince.

Baluzius has given us the acts of this holy Presbyter, in the ſecond tome of his miſcellanies *p.* 141. We met with them in a manuſcript of Beauvais, tho' not ſo entire; and thoſe which we had already in Mombritius, are not very different from them. The air of them is not bad, and the author pretends to be Oroſius the Prieſt who buried that Saint. But they ſuppoſe quite thro' that Liberius and Conſtantius were at Rome at the ſame time; which never happen'd. They ſay that Damaſus being made Pope, anathematiz'd Liberius in a Council. Baluzius obſerves in his notes p. 498, that this Council is no where elſe to be found; [and he need not wonder at it, ſince there never was any ſuch: Which we ſhould not be afraid to aſſert, tho' we had not the letter of the Council of Rome held under Damaſus,] μ which rejects the Council of Ariminum, becauſe it was not receiv'd by the then Biſhop of Rome, [that is certainly by Liberius.] ν Theſe acts add, that after the death of Liberius the perſecution ceas'd, but not long. [It began again then ſoon. But when? All that can be ſaid is, that it was under Juſtina, twenty years after the death of Liberius: And we do not even find Juſtina rais'd any perſecution at all at Rome.

We ſhall not then be put to much difficulty to juſtify Liberius, whom theſe acts make the author of the perſecution of S. Euſebius and many others, nor to vindicate this Saint, whom they make a perjur'd ſchiſmatick according to S. Jerom, by plainly

ζ *Sacr. p.* 122. η *n. p.* 174. θ *Front. cal. p.* 121. ι *p.* 53. κ *Buch. cycl. p.* 272. λ *Bar.* 14. *aug. h.* μ *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 17. *p.* 618. *b.* ν *Baluz. t.* 2. *p.* 142.

making

making him a partisan of Felix, which Usuardus and Ado say nothing of. But what is most puzzling in this affair, is that what Ado says of S. Eusebius is so agreeable to his acts, that there is reason to fear he borrow'd from thence. Yet perhaps both Ado and the author of these acts might follow the same more ancient Original, of which the latter made a monstrous story. For I do not see how it can be call'd any thing else. And indeed Ado is so far from saying that Liberius persecuted the Catholick Church, that he says the Arians were they that did it, *when Liberius sat in the Apostolical see.* This is not as one would talk of a persecutor. So that neither he nor Usuardus make him have a hand in the persecution of S. Eusebius. But whatever come of the facts related by Ado, the holiness of S. Eusebius appears sufficiently attested by the monuments of the Church, to assure us he could neither be perjur'd, nor a schismatick, nor consequently on the side of Felix.]

NOTE LX. referr'd to in §. 75. p. 252.

Upon the pretended martyrdom of Felix the Antipope.

[WE do not see that there is any room to reject what Marcellinus and Faustinus tell us, that] ξ Felix who was put into Liberius's place, died upon the 22d of November 365. [They were both Presbyters of Rome, who liv'd at the same time, and relate matters very circumstantially; and we do not see what interest they had to lengthen the life of Felix six or seven years, and advance a lye which would have been immediately discover'd by the whole world. But if what they say be true, no credit can be given to those who write, that Felix was martyr'd by Constantius's order upon the 28th of July 359. Neither do we find any foundation for it ancienter than Bollandus's Pontifical made in the sixth century, if it be really so old, copied by him who wrote the pretended acts of Felix, by Anastasius, and some others.] ο Bollandus's Pontifical, after many things which are perfectly intolerable, says that Felix being depos'd from the episcopate, resided from the 30th of July upon an estate that he had; [that before or after his deposition] he declar'd Constantius [the Emperor] an heretick, who had been baptiz'd twice, [and yet his first baptism was at the time of his death in 361;] that he was crown'd with martyrdom, and that he was beheaded privately, [tho'] with a great many Ecclesiasticks and laicks, near the walls of Rome, upon the 11th of November; that Damasus a Priest remov'd his body from thence, and buried it in a Church which Felix had built. It adds, that the see was vacant thirty eight days, [as if at the end of that time they had given him a successor.]

ξ *Mar. & F. p.* 4. ο *Boll. apr. t.* 1. *p.* 31. *d, e.*

π The

τ The acts of Felix say likewise, that Constantius was rebaptiz'd by Eusebius of Nicomedia at Aquilo; [This is enough to give us a judgment of the piece;] that Felix declar'd him an heretick; that upon this account he was turn'd out of the bishoprick by Constantius, and Liberius recall'd at the request of the Priests Ursacius and Valens, &c; ρ That Felix was forc'd from his estate where he liv'd, and brought to Rome, where he was beheaded upon the 10th of November; That his body was buried upon the 20th of the same month in the Church which he built when he was a Priest; and we celebrate his festival, says the author, upon the 29th of July.

σ Anastasius follows Bollandus's Pontifical almost word for word: but he makes Felix to have been beheaded at Cora [in Campagnia di Roma, unless it is a mistake of the transcriber, Corana for Romana, which is probable enough.] τ Baronius will have it to be at Cære in Tuscany, [which is call'd at present Ceri or Cerventera.] υ Anastasius had said a little before, that Felix died in peace at his estate in the Porto road upon the 29th of July, *requievit in pace*. [Ado, who it is plain transcrib'd from the same accounts, has likewise fallen into some errors which no body dares defend. It is added to confirm this tradition, that] φ the Church of Cære, which honours him for their patron, proves his martyrdom. [But it is not said how long they have honour'd him, nor is it shewn that this is not S. Felix the Pope martyr'd in the year 274 under Aurelian, or even some other martyr of the same name, who might afterwards have the title of Pope given him. As for the monuments of this Church which are alledg'd, they must be very authentick and many ages old, to be sufficient to be oppos'd to Marcellinus.

This then is the state of the question: Two Priests who relate a fact which happen'd in their own time and in the place where they liv'd, without having any reason to alter any circumstance, are oppos'd by authors much more modern,] χ full of certain mistakes, even in the fact itself. [The cause does not appear very difficult to decide.] ↓ And Baronius was of opinion, that Felix should be taken out of the Roman martyrology, and he had persuaded most people to this in a great dispute which arose at Rome under Gregory XIII. upon this very subject. But he says, the Pope's will had made him change his mind, besides that in 1582 upon the 28th of July, which is the eve of the festival of S. Felix Pope and Martyr, whom they pretend to be the same with this, they had found his tomb with this inscription, *The body of S. Felix Pope and Martyr, who condemn'd Constantius.*

[Without examining this history, this inscription which taken by itself does not appear to be of the IV century, proves nothing but that it was believ'd that Felix had been Pope and Martyr,

π *MS. p.* 218. ρ *p.* 218, 219. σ *Anast. c.* 37. *p.* 21.
τ *Bar.* 357. §. 58. υ *Anast. c.* 37. *p.* 22. φ *Bar.* 357. §. 58.
χ *Bar.* 357. §. 61. ↓ §. 62, 63.

which

which was known very well by Anaſtaſius and others; but the queſtion is whether this ſhould have been believ'd. What the inſcription mentions, that Felix condemn'd Conſtantius, is juſt the ſame with the ridiculous ſtories of Anaſtaſius, and is ſo much the leſs fit to be receiv'd: 1ſt, Becauſe no ancient author, neither S. Jerom nor any other, has mention'd this condemnation, tho' it muſt have made a great noiſe in the world: 2ly, It was not the cuſtom then to treat Princes in that manner, the Church having leſs regard to what they deſerv'd, than to the bad conſequences which theſe condemnations might produce: 3ly,] ω Becauſe Conſtantius above all others ſhould not have been us'd ſo, becauſe he was only a catechumen, and did not participate of the Myſteries.

[If it ſhould be ſaid, it is not probable that ſo many things ſhould be only invention, they who ſay ſo muſt have but little knowledge of what has been done upon other occaſions. And without going farther, thoſe who were capable of impoſing upon us letters written to Felix by S. Athanaſius, and that at the head of a Council of Alexandria, with an anſwer of Felix's, and another letter from Felix to all the Biſhops, dated in Conſulates which never were: Theſe perſons, I ſay, and others like them, are capable of believing upon the faith of others, or of inventing themſelves the moſt ridiculous and moſt abſurd forgeries.

Beſides the argument which is taken from Marcellinus, who does not place the death of Felix till Valentinian's reign,] α Father Fronto declares that the ſame thing may be prov'd by a regiſter of that time cited by Onuphrius. We have ſome lives of the Popes by Onuphrius printed in 1557, in which he cites nothing in particular: But *p.* 14, he lengthens the life of Felix to the 22d of November 365, and makes him not a Pope and Martyr, but the ſecond Antipope. [And it muſt be added, that Conſtantius who profeſs'd to be mild and moderate, ſpar'd himſelf at leaſt the ſhame of ſhedding the blood of Biſhops, and was contented with baniſhing them, unleſs he was extremely irritated againſt them. And we do not find in any good hiſtorian, that Felix did any thing to anger him. We may even ſay, that a man who came into the epiſcopate as he had done, was unworthy and incapable of any couragious action, without an extraordinary miracle of grace: And to believe it we ought to ſee inconteſtable authorities.]

β In the moſt ancient martyrologies we find upon the 29th of July a S. Felix martyr'd at Rome, who may have been a Pope, ſince this title is given him in Father Fronto's Kalendar *p.* 109. He was at leaſt a Biſhop, according to S. Gregory's Sacramentary *p.* 117. Bede takes notice of him without giving him any title. Uſuardus, Ado, and other moderns have taken him for him who liv'd in Conſtantius's time; and the author of theſe acts ſay that his feſtival was celebrated on that day. [But we do

ω §. 61. α *Front. cal. p.* 109, 110. β *Florent. p.* 686.

not

not see upon what this is founded. It is certain, as we have observ'd, this is neither the day of his death, nor that of his burial. So that Father Fronto had some reason to believe, that this] γ S. Felix Pope and Martyr, who is honour'd upon the 28th of July, is Felix I. who died in 274; since otherwise this Pope, to whom the ancients and moderns give the title of Martyr, and whose letters were cited in the Council of Ephesus, would not be mention'd at all in the ancient martyrologies, [or at least in the Roman Kalendar and in the Sacramentary.]

δ This Father says however at the conclusion, that he will not assert any thing upon this subject, because there are Litanies in an ancient manuscript of seven or eight hundred years old, which put the intruder among the Popes with the title of Saint and Confessor, which they give in the same manner to Julius and Damasus. [These Litanies may shew, if they are of the VIII century, that it is a great while since some people have look'd upon this Felix as an holy Pope. But at the same time they make against his pretended martyrdom. For I believe there is no example of giving the plain title of Confessor to those who were known to have been beheaded for the faith. At least the example which is alledg'd, does not prove it, since the martyrdom of S. Urbanus the Pope is as little attested as that of this Felix.

As for Felix's piety, if he had return'd into the unity of the Roman Church, and submitted to Liberius, there would be some reason to hope that he had aton'd for the crime of his intrusion and schism.

The difficulty of knowing whether he should have a place among the Bishops of Rome, does not properly relate to history. We may however observe, that S. Optatus who liv'd at this very time, and S. Augustin, do not put him in that catalogue, and did not think it necessaryto join this perpetual chain of the epilcopate in the Church of Rome.] ε Theodorit in the list that he gives us of the Bishops of the principal sees, does not so much as name him, any more than Gregory and George of Alexandria according to Father Sirmondus's edition, tho' he does not forget the usurpers of the sees of Antioch and Constantinople, and mentions even Gregory and George of Alexandria according to Valesius's edition *p.* 249. ζ And yet he was not ignorant of his intrusion; [neither can it be presum'd that he did not know of Liberius's crime, tho' he has taken no notice of it. Nor does S. Jerom place him in the number of the Popes. He reckons Liberius for the 34th Bishop of Rome, and Damasus for the 35th, in which he is follow'd by S. Prosper, and without doubt by many others. And the same thing is to be seen in Anastasius. S. Athanasius speaks of Felix as a monster in the Apostolick throne, and I do not think that any Father or any ecclesiastical author ever mention'd him as a lawful Bishop.

It is certain he was an Antipope as long as Liberius continued in the truth. Tho' Liberius might have been legally depos'd after his

γ *Front. cal. p.* 109. δ *p.* 110, 111. ε *Theodrt. l.* 5. *c.* 39. *p.* 755. ζ *l.* 2. *c.* 14. *p.* 610. *c.*

fall,

fall, yet as we do not find that the Church attempted to do it, or was then in a condition to think of it, no perſon had any right to take his place, unleſs the Roman Church in a body ſeparated from him. And this is what was not done.] ɳ For one part of the Clergy and all the people continued united with him. θ As for thoſe of the Clergy who ſeparated from him, they did it before his fall, as Marcellinus ſays expreſly. ι S. Jerom ſays the ſame, [and if people will find ambiguity in his words, they cannot deny that he condemns his eccleſiaſticks for perjury, and by conſequence he muſt have diſapprov'd of their ſeparation, at what time ſoever it was made.

But if after Liberius's fall it was neceſſary to chooſe another Biſhop, Felix was not the perſon to be choſe, who was guilty, as well as Liberius, of communicating with the Arians, beſides the fault of his ſchiſm and criminal intruſion. And there is not even any likelihood, that he refus'd to ſign the confeſſions of the Arians, if they were preſented to him. For as to all that it is ſaid he did for the ſervice of truth after Liberius's fall, we ſee no teſtimony of it before the IX century; and thoſe who have mention'd it, are authors of ſo little credit in any thing, and have mix'd ſo many fables and contradictions with what they ſay of Liberius himſelf, that they do not at all deſerve to be minded.

But if he was ever Pope, he could not ceaſe to be ſo by Liberius's recovery, but only for falling into ſome new crime; which is what no body ſays. He muſt then have been Pope till the end of the year 365, and Liberius muſt then have been Antipope, or elſe there muſt have been two Popes at a time. Why then muſt we embarraſs ourſelves in ſo many difficulties, to defend a man whom all antiquity gives up, who muſt be confeſs'd to have been at leaſt for two years the horror of the whole Church, and who cannot be defended but upon principles entirely deſtructive, and authorities not at all conſiderable, which deſtroy themſelves, and are contradicted by original pieces? We have ſeen, that Onuphrius makes him abſolutely an Antipope, as he does Novatian whom he places the firſt.] κ Father Labbé who by a viſible error places the death of Felix in 357, and before the fall of Liberius, could not think that he was ever a lawful Biſhop, and he always calls him who was made Pope in 485 Felix II. obſerving only at his death in 492, that he is the third of that name according to Baronius. λ Cardinal Bona ſays likewiſe, that it was Felix II. who held the ſee of Rome in the time of Acacius of Conſtantinople.

ɳ *Mar. & F. p.* 4, 5. θ *p.* 3. ι *Hier. chr.* κ *Lab. chr.* λ *Bona, lit. l.* 2. *c.* 11. *p.* 423.

NOTE

NOTE LXI. referr'd to in §. 75. p. 252.

Upon the confession of faith, which Liberius, as is said, sent to S. Athanasius.

μ BARONIUS thinks, that Liberius in order to renew communion and make an entire union with S. Athanasius, sent him a confession of his faith. We have in S. Athanasius's works *t.* 1. *p.* 243, 244, this confession of Liberius's which seems to be the conclusion of a letter, together with that of S. Athanasius which is as it were an answer to that letter. ν But Bellarmin, and Rivetus afterwards, are of opinion that these pieces are spurious. Liberius in his *p.* 243. *d*, writes as doubting of S. Athanasius's faith, and bids him let him know whether he maintains the true belief as well as him, which Bellarmin himself does not think probable[1].

[1] See S. Athanasius, §. 111. note 100.

NOTE LXII. referr'd to in §. 76. p. 254.

Whether it was Basil of Ancyra, who propos'd Nice to Constantius for the place of holding the General Council.

[THERE is a pretty deal of difficulty in what Sozomen says, that] ξ it was Basil of Ancyra, who propos'd Nice to Constantius for the place of holding the General Council. ο For Philostorgius says, that Basil and his partisans refus'd Nice, even after the destruction of Nicomedia; π and Theodorit says, that it was Eudoxius who got it propos'd and determin'd, by means of the friends he had at Court. ρ And S. Athanasius seems to say, that it was Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, Acacius, Eudoxius, and Patrophilus, [all Anomœans,] who persuaded Constantius to order the Council to meet at Nice. [But as Sozomen seems to have read the very letter of Basil to Constantius, it may be probable enough that it was only the division of the Council into two that proceeded from the Anomœans,] σ who, as the same Sozomen shews clearly enough, could not find their advantage in an universal Council.

μ *Bar.* 357. §. 72, 73. ν *Riv. l.* 3. *c.* 7. *p.* 279. ξ *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 26. *p.* 561. *a*, *b*. ο *Philg. l.* 4. *c.* 11. *p.* 71. π *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 21. *p.* 623. ρ *Ath. de syn. p.* 869, 870. σ *Soz. p.* 562. *b*, *c*.

NOTE

fall, yet as we do not find that the Church attempted to do it, or was then in a condition to think of it, no person had any right to take his place, unless the Roman Church in a body separated from him. And this is what was not done.] η For one part of the Clergy and all the people continued united with him. θ As for those of the Clergy who separated from him, they did it before his fall, as Marcellinus says expressly. ι S. Jerom says the same, [and if people will find ambiguity in his words, they cannot deny that he condemns his ecclesiasticks for perjury, and by consequence he must have disapprov'd of their separation, at what time soever it was made.

But if after Liberius's fall it was necessary to choose another Bishop, Felix was not the person to be chose, who was guilty, as well as Liberius, of communicating with the Arians, besides the fault of his schism and criminal intrusion. And there is not even any likelihood, that he refus'd to sign the confessions of the Arians, if they were presented to him. For as to all that it is said he did for the service of truth after Liberius's fall, we see no testimony of it before the IX century; and those who have mention'd it, are authors of so little credit in any thing, and have mix'd so many fables and contradictions with what they say of Liberius himself, that they do not at all deserve to be minded.

But if he was ever Pope, he could not cease to be so by Liberius's recovery, but only for falling into some new crime; which is what no body says. He must then have been Pope till the end of the year 365, and Liberius must then have been Antipope, or else there must have been two Popes at a time. Why then must we embarrass ourselves in so many difficulties, to defend a man whom all antiquity gives up, who must be confess'd to have been at least for two years the horror of the whole Church, and who cannot be defended but upon principles entirely destructive, and authorities not at all considerable, which destroy themselves, and are contradicted by original pieces? We have seen, that Onuphrius makes him absolutely an Antipope, as he does Novatian whom he places the first.] κ Father Labbé who by a visible error places the death of Felix in 357, and before the fall of Liberius, could not think that he was ever a lawful Bishop, and he always calls him who was made Pope in 485 Felix II. observing only at his death in 492, that he is the third of that name according to Baronius. λ Cardinal Bona says likewise, that it was Felix II. who held the see of Rome in the time of Acacius of Constantinople.

η *Mar. & F. p.* 4, 5. θ *p.* 3. ι *Hier. chr.* κ *Lab. chr.* λ *Bona, lit. l.* 2. *c.* 11. *p.* 423.

NOTE

NOTE LXI. referr'd to in §. 75. p. 252.

Upon the confession of faith, which Liberius, as is said, sent to S. Athanasius.

μ BARONIUS thinks, that Liberius in order to renew communion and make an entire union with S. Athanasius, sent him a confession of his faith We have in S. Athanasius's works *t.* 1. *p.* 243, 244, this confession of Liberius's which seems to be the conclusion of a letter, together with that of S. Athanasius which is as it were an answer to that letter. ν But Bellarmin, and Rivetus afterwards, are of opinion that these pieces are spurious. Liberius in his *p.* 243. *d*, writes as doubting of S. Athanasius's faith, and bids him let him know whether he maintains the true belief as well as him, which Bellarmin himself does not think probable[1].

[1] See S. Athanasius, §. 111. note 100.

NOTE LXII. referr'd to in §. 76. p. 254.

Whether it was Basil of Ancyra, who propos'd Nice to Constantius for the place of holding the General Council.

[THERE is a pretty deal of difficulty in what Sozomen says, that] ξ it was Basil of Ancyra, who propos'd Nice to Constantius for the place of holding the General Council. ο For Philostorgius says, that Basil and his partisans refus'd Nice, even after the destruction of Nicomedia; π and Theodorit says, that it was Eudoxius who got it propos'd and determin'd, by means of the friends he had at Court. ρ And S. Athanasius seems to say, that it was Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, Acacius, Eudoxius, and Patrophilus, [all Anomœans,] who persuaded Constantius to order the Council to meet at Nice. [But as Sozomen seems to have read the very letter of Basil to Constantius, it may be probable enough that it was only the division of the Council into two that proceeded from the Anomœans,] σ who, as the same Sozomen shews clearly enough, could not find their advantage in an universal Council.

μ *Bar.* 357. §. 72, 73. ν *Riv. l.* 3. *c.* 7. *p.* 279. ξ *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 26. *p.* 561. *a, b.* ο *Phisg. l.* 4. *c.* 11. *p.* 71. π *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 21. *p.* 623. ρ *Ath. de syn. p.* 869, 870. σ *Soz. p.* 562. *b, c.*

NOTE

NOTE LXIII. referr'd to in §. 78. p. 262.

Upon the number of Biſhops at the Council of Ariminum.

τ WHereas S. Athanaſius obſerves in two places, that there were more than 400 Biſhops at the Council of Ariminum, υ he himſelf in another paſſage reckons no more than near 200 Catholicks, which makes a wide difference: φ And Baronius thinks that there is a miſtake in this laſt paſſage. χ It is follow'd by the author of the Synodicon, who commits many others. ψ Blondel ſeems likewiſe to reckon 400 Biſhops belonging to this Council. ω Maximinus an Arian Biſhop makes them but 330. α On the contrary Julian the Pelagian ſays, that it was held there were 650 there. β The Arians of the VIth century make them 830. γ S. Jerom calls them the multitude of Prelates aſſembled at Ariminum, to give an idea of a very great number of Biſhops. [We can gather nothing from what Facundus ſays,] δ that they were a much larger number than thoſe of the falſe Council of Epheſus, where there were only 130.

NOTE LXIV. referr'd to in §. 78. p. 262.

Upon Demophilus, who aſſiſted at the Council of Ariminum.

ε DEmophilus's being plac'd with the Weſterns in the Council of Ariminum, [raiſes a difficulty.] He is taken notice of as one of the principal of the Arians. [So that I think we cannot doubt but he is] ζ Demophilus of Berea whom they made Biſhop of Conſtantinople in 370 after Eudoxius. [There is Berea in Thrace, and Berea in Macedonia. If Demophilus was Biſhop of this laſt place, he muſt be at the Council of Ariminum, for Macedonia and all the reſt of Illyricum was then reckon'd part of the Weſt.] η But Theodorit makes him Biſhop of Berea in Thrace. θ And it was Biſhop Demophilus who made Liberius ſign the confeſſion of Sirmium, ι and Liberius was baniſh'd to

τ *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 814. *c.* | 908. *b.* υ *ad Afr. p.* 934. *a.* φ *Bar.* 359. §. 3. χ *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 94. *b.* ψ *Blond. prim. p.* 150. ω *Aug. in Ma. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.* 284. 1. *a.* α *op. imp. l.* 1. *c.* 75. *p.* 27. β *Fulg. ad pint. c.* 3. *p.* 535. γ *Hier. ep.* 83. *c.* 1. *t.* 2. *p.* 319. *b.* δ *Fac. l.* 5. *c.* 3. *p.* 201. *a.* | *not.* ε *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 874. *c.* | *ad Afr. p.* 934. *a.* *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 37. *p.* 132. *c.* | *Soz. l.* 3. *c.* 17. *p.* 563. ζ *Thdrt. l.* 5. *c.* 39. *p.* 756. | *Phiſg. l.* 9. *c.* 8. *p.* 126. η *Thdrt. p.* 756. θ *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 48. ι *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 13, 14. *p.* 609. *c.* | 610. *a.*

Berea

ν Berea in Thrace. [If then he was of Thrace, he ſhould be at Seleucia with the Eaſterns; for Thrace always made part of the Eaſtern Empire:] ξ And Philoſtorgius expreſly places Thrace among the provinces that ſhould compoſe the Council of the Eaſterns. ο Sulpitius Severus does not place it among thoſe that ſhould be at Ariminum. [We do not ſee what can be ſaid upon this point.] ν See Note 45.

NOTE LXV. referr'd to in §. 79. p. 266.

Whether Demophilus and Auxentius were condemn'd by the Council of Ariminum.

π URſacius, Valens, Caius, and Germinius were condemn'd by name in the Council of Ariminum, according to the Greek and Latin text of an Act of this Council which we have, which is a petition of Grecian Biſhop of Cagli. ρ S. Athanaſius ſometimes joins to them Demophilus, σ and Socrates does the ſame thing. τ And yet it is pretty clear S. Athanaſius himſelf in another place excepts him; υ and the letter of the Council to Conſtantius does not name him at all.

φ It places Auxentius among the condemn'd, according to the Greek text, as well as the petition of Grecian. χ Yet the Latin text of theſe two pieces never mentions him, ψ and we do not find that S. Hilary in the diſpute he had with him, reproach'd him with having been depos'd at Ariminum, tho' he had all the reaſon in the world to do it. ω However Auxentius himſelf declares he was preſent at the concluſion of this aſſembly. ϕ S. Athanaſius once places one Eudoxius among the Arians depos'd at Ariminum, [but this is probably a miſtake:] χ And yet the Benedictins take no notice of it in their new edition, where this Eudoxius is to be met with as in the others.

NOTE LXVI. referr'd to in §. 81. p. 271.

That the confeſſion of faith of Nicæ or Ariminum was made in the year 359.

ϟ S. Athanaſius ſays, that the confeſſion of faith which we call the confeſſion of Nicæ or Ariminum, was made in the Coun-

ξ *Phiſg. l. 4. c. 10. p. 70.* ο *Sulp. l. 2. p. 162.* π *Ath. de ſyn. p. 879. d.* ρ *Hil. fr. 2. p. 46.* σ *Ath. p. 876. d.* τ *Socr. l. 2. c. 37. p. 136. b.* υ *Ath. ad Aſr. p. 939. a.* φ *de ſyn. p. 878. c.* χ *c. 879. d.* ψ *Hil. fr. 2. p. 35, 46.* ω *in Aux. p. 122.* ϕ *p. 123. 2. a.* χ *t. 1. B. p. 893. b.* ϟ *Ath. de ſyn. p. 905. c.*

cil of Constantinople after that of Isauria; [because it was in effect receiv'd in this Council which was held at the beginning of the year 360, but this does not hinder but it might have appear'd before, that is, before the tenth of October 359.] ω For we have an instrument dated upon this day, in which the legates of the Council of Ariminum revoke all that had been done at Ariminum, embrace the communion of Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and Caius, and declare that they had already sign'd the confession of faith of these hereticks. [And it being plain by this very passage, acccording to S. Athanasius, as well as according to Thodorit,] α that the confession of Nicæ is that which was sign'd at Ariminum, [it could not be made by the Council of Constantinople, which was held, as we shall see, at the beginning of the following year, after the conclusion of that of Ariminum. To which may be added, that it was written originally in Latin, and not in Greek which was the language of the Easterns and of Constantinople: Which appears plainly from the different manner in which it is reported by S. Athanasius *p.* 905, and Theodorit, *p.* 615. But it is not even necessary to say, that S. Athanasius speaks of the Council of Constantinople in 360. For he says only that the Arians being come from Isauria to Constantinople, drew up the confession which he reports, and sent it to Ariminum: And we do not see any thing that hinders us from believing this to be literally true.]

NOTE LXVII. referr'd to in §. 81. p. 274.

That the same confession was sign'd at Ariminum as at Nicæ.

[IT appears clear enough of itself, that the Bishops of the Council of Ariminum were made to sign the same confession as their deputies had sign'd at Nicæ.] β What follows in Sulpitius Severus shews it plainly enough, γ and he says expressly that they sign'd at Ariminum that confession of which Constantius was the author, [that is the third of Sirmium, from which that of Nicæ hardly differs.] δ S. Athanasius reporting this confession, says that it was that which was caus'd to be sign'd at Ariminum and in the West. ε He says likewise, that they had rejected at Ariminum the word *hypostasis*; [and that is not to be found in any but the confession of Nicæ.] ζ That which S. Jerom takes notice was sign'd at Ariminum, is still more agreeable to this confession than to the third of Sirmium, [tho' they are almost only the same thing] η Theodorit likewise confirms it,

ω *Hil. fr.* 2. *p.* 36, 37. α *Ath. de syn. p.* 905. *c.* β *Sulp. l.* 2. *p.* 165, 167. γ *p.* 167. δ *Ath. de syn. p.* 905. *c.* ε *ad Afr. p.* 935. *a.* ζ *Hier. in Luci. c.* 7. *p.* 142. *d.* η *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 16 -- 18. *p.* 615 -- 620.

for

for in order to shew that the confession of Nicæ had been condemn'd by the Church, he reports what the Council of Rome under Damasus and S. Athanasius say against the subscription of Ariminum.

NOTE LXVIII. referr'd to in §. 82. p. 275.

That the Bishops did not stay seven months at Ariminum.

[WHereas we make Taurus say, that the Bishops had already been for several months at Ariminum,] θ the text of Sulpitius Severus has it, that they had already been there seven months. [Thus this Council must have continued at least till January or February 360, and it must be said that S. Phebadius and the twenty others still maintain'd at that time the Consubstantiality. But there is some mistake or some exaggeration in this term of seven months. For we do not see how we can settle the things which were done at Constantinople, if we do not acknowledge that the Bishops deputed by the Council of Ariminum after the subscription of S. Phebadius, were arriv'd there before the end of 359. The first deputies of the Council had sign'd as early as the 10th of October: And thus we may judge that S. Phebadius and the others who resisted the most, yielded at last about the month of November.]

NOTE LXIX. referr'd to in §. 84. p. 285.

Inadvertencies of Baronius concerning Liberius and Damasus.

ι BAronius says, that Sozomen speaks of the expulsion of Liberius after the Council of Ariminum, tho' he had spoken before of his banishment after the Council of Milan: [but he does not observe, that Sozomen is here reporting the false account of Socrates,] κ and that when he relates immediately after the truth of what pass'd at Ariminum, he says nothing of the persecution of Liberius.

λ If it is true, as Baronius pretends, that Damasus follow'd Felix to the time of his death, [and that Felix did not die till 365, he could not] govern the Church of Rome under Liberius in 360, as Baronius would have it.

θ *Sulp. l. 2. p. 166.* ι *Bar. 359. §. 47.* κ *Soz. l. 4. c. 19. p. 569, 570.* λ *Bar. 359. §. 48.*

NOTE LXX. referr'd to in §. 84. p. 285.

Upon S. Gaudentius Biſhop of Ariminum, S. Leo Prieſt, and S. Marinus Deacon of the ſame Church.

μ BAronius ſays, that Gaudentius was Biſhop of Ariminum when the Council was held there; that he withdrew from that Council before the prevarication of the Biſhops; that after the unhappy concluſion of it he condemn'd what the Arians had done in it, and depos'd one Marcian a Prieſt who was guilty of the ſame impiety; that upon this account the ſoldiers of the Governor, whoſe name was likewiſe Marcian, took him out of the city, and beat and ſton'd him to death in the ſuburbs. He cites nothing for all theſe particulars but the acts of this Saint, which we have not, and of which he gives no other character but that they are different from the other acts of this Saint, which he rejects as entirely ſpurious, and in which it is ſaid that he was made Biſhop by Damaſus a long time after the Council of Ariminum. He ſeems to ſay that even the acts which he approves of, declare that S. Mercurial Biſhop of Forli, whom he maintains to have been dead in 156, was S. Gaudentius's cotemporary. [Ferrarius had not theſe acts which Baronius receives:] ν For all that he ſays of S. Gaudentius, is taken from Petrus de Natalibus, ξ who makes S. Gaudentius baptiz'd, ordain'd Clerk, &c. by S. Damaſus the Pope [after the year 366,] and martyr'd in Conſtantius's reign at the time of the Council of Ariminum, [that is, in 361 at the lateſt. We might take notice of ſome other miſtakes in him.] ο Ughellus, [notwithſtanding Baronius's obſervation,] makes S. Gaudentius ordain'd likewiſe by Damaſus, and yet places his martyrdom in the reign of Conſtans. π Baronius himſelf in his martyrology cites nothing for this Saint but Petrus de Natalibus. ρ He is likewiſe mention'd in the hiſtory of S. Leo and S. Marinus, which is in Mombritius *t.* 2. *p.* 52. And according to this hiſtory he muſt have been made Biſhop of Ariminum about the year 320. [But it is a very faulty piece.] σ In it is mention'd the ſchiſmatical hereſy of Marcian the Prieſt who was excommunicated by S. Gaudentius. τ So that we muſt be content with knowing, that the Church of Ariminum honours S. Gaudentius as its Biſhop, its patron, and as a Martyr, and that it is thought he was martyr'd in Conſtantius's reign by the Arians. υ Over his tomb they have built a Church of his name, which is become a conſiderable abbey of the Benedictins. φ His

μ *Bar.* 359. §. 60. ν *Ferr. p.* 650. ξ *P. de N. l.* 9. *c.* 63. *p.* 182. 2, 3. ο *Ugh. t.* 2. *p.* 408. *a.* π *Bar.* 14. *oct. f.* ρ *MS. p.* 550, 556, 557. σ *p.* 557. τ *Ugh. t.* 2. *p.* 408. *a.* 410. υ *p.* 410. *b, c.* φ *p.* 413 — 415. | *P. de N. p.* 182. 3.

body

body was found there seventy years after his death, or a long time since, as may be judg'd by the history related in Ughellus. His festival is plac'd upon the 14th of October in the Roman martyrology.

[To justify what we have said, that the acts of S. Leo and S. Marinus are a very faulty piece, there is no occasion for any other proof than their barbarous eloquence mix'd with ends of verses; which seems to me to be the style of the IXth and Xth centuries; and if the style was the best in the world,] χ the romantick stories which they tell without connexion and without probability, [would be enough to destroy all their authority. What Petrus de Natalibus *l.* 8. *c.* 36. *p.* 157, and Ferrarius *p.* 480, 568, say of them, has yet less authority. So that we must be content with knowing, that it is said that S. Leo was Priest and S. Marinus Deacon of the Church of Ariminum, that it is held that they pass'd the greatest part of their life in that city and the private places about it, that they preach'd the faith there to the Pagans, and that they are honour'd at present as patrons of the two towns which bear their names in the Dutchy of Urbino. Their acts make them live in Diocletian's great persecution, and fifteen or twenty years after. And yet if they were ordain'd by S. Gaudentius, and this Saint was made a Bishop by Damasus, they must be plac'd at the end of the IVth century. The festival of S. Leo is celebrated upon the first of August,] ψ and that of S. Marinus upon the third of September, tho' it is plac'd upon the fourth in the Roman martyrology.

NOTE LXXI. referr'd to in §. 85. p. 287.

Upon Bishop Asterius, who was excommunicated by the Council of Seleucia.

ASterius, who Socrates says was separated from communion by the Council of Seleucia in 359, without mentioning what place he was Bishop of, α is, according to Blondel, him whom S. Jerom places among the illustrious writers of his time, and who he says was Bishop of Scythopolis. Blondel does not say why he will have him to be this Asterius; [and I do not see how it can be said to be him, when Patrophilus was still Bishop of Scythopolis in the year 359,] β and had one Philip for his successor, who in all likelihood was alive when S. Epiphanius wrote [in 376,] or had been dead but a little while. [So that Asterius of Scythopolis was not a Bishop till a long time af-

χ *Ferr. p.* 569. ψ *p.* 569. ω *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 40. *p.* 152. *c.* α *Blond. prim. p.* 137. *Hier. ep.* 84. *t.* 2. *p.* 327. *b.* β *Epi.* 73. *c.* 23. *p.* 872. *a.*

ter the Council of Seleucia: and we have no ground to say that he was an Arian, as he was whom Socrates mentions [a]. There would be more reason to say, that he who was Bishop as early as the year 359, is] [y] him whom God slew at Cyrus about the year 372, at the request of S. Julian Saba.

[a] See S. Asterius of Amasea, note 1.

NOTE LXXII. referr'd to in §. 88. p. 302.

That the law, which subjected Bishops to secular offices, does not relate to the Bishops condemn'd in 360 by the Council of Constantinople.

[δ] WHAT Socrates places immediately after the Council of Seleucia, that Constantius by condemning the Bishops to secular offices, &c. [seems as if it might agree better with the Bishops condemn'd in the year 360 by the Council of Constantinople; but as these last were sentenc'd to be banish'd, they could not be subjected at the same time to these offices, which often requir'd personal attendance.]

NOTE LXXIII. referr'd to in §. 92. p. 314.

That the confession confirm'd in the Council of Constantinople was that of Nice.

[ε] SOcrates and Sozomen say, that the Council of Constantinople confirm'd the dated confession that had been read at Ariminum, tacking however some additions to it. [But the thing is, they confound the confession drawn up at Sirmium the 22d of May 359, and presented immediately at Ariminum by the Arians, with that which was sign'd there by every body at the conclusion of the Council, and which is no other than the same that had been sign'd before at Nicæ. For it was this last that was approv'd at Constantinople without any alteration,] [ζ] as may be seen by Socrates who relates it.

[y] *Theodrt. v. Pat. c. 2. p. 783. c, d.* [δ] *Socr. l. 2. c. 41. p. 153. b, c.* [ε] *Socr. l. 2. c. 41. p. 153. c.* | *Soz. l. 4. c. 24. p. 579. c.* [ζ] *Socr. p. 153, 154.*

NOTE

NOTE LXXIV. referr'd to in §. 92. p. 317.

That there is all the reaſon in the world to believe, that Auxentius of Mopſueſtia was ſo far from deſerving the title of Saint, that he was an Arian.

ν BAronius has plac'd Auxentius Biſhop of Mopſueſtia in the Roman martyrology upon the 18th of December, citing for it the authority of the Greeks and of Suidas. [I do not know what Greeks he means. For there is nothing of Auxentius upon the 18th of December, either in the Menæa, or in the menologium of Ughellus; neither is there any thing at all ſaid of him in the menologium of Caniſius, which Baronius us'd to follow.]

θ As for Suidas, he ſays that Auxentius confeſs'd Jeſus Chriſt under Licinius, and the hiſtory which he relates of him is pleaſant. He adds that he was made Biſhop of Mopſueſtia ſome time after this, [that is however more than twenty two years after, or even more than twenty ſeven, ſince Macedonius was ſtill Biſhop of Mopſueſtia in 347, and perhaps in 351, in which year he ſeems to have aſſiſted at the Council of Sirmium.] Suidas ſays alſo, that Auxentius had a brother younger than himſelf, whoſe name was Theodorus, who was afterwards made Biſhop of Tarſus. [We know of no other Theodorus but him who is ſet down in the ſubſcriptions to the Council of Nice, and who was therefore a Biſhop twenty or thirty years before his elder brother.]

ι The acts of S. Nicetas written by Metaphraſtes, ſpeak likewiſe of Auxentius Biſhop of Mopſueſtia, whom they call Saint. They ſay that he built a Church of the holy martyrs Tarachus, Probus, and Adronicus, ſome of whoſe relicks the Church of Anazarbus gave him, and that when he would likewiſe give ſome of thoſe of S. Nicetas to thoſe of Anazarbus, he was hindred from doing it by a miracle. κ This S. Nicetas ſuffer'd in Athanaric's perſecution, [which muſt be plac'd about the year 370.] His body was brought from the country of the Goths to Mopſueſtia, where it did many miracles, and where a Church was built in honour of him. [So that Auxentius muſt have liv'd at leaſt till about 375, but this does not at all agree with Suidas, it being difficult to think that a man who had been ſecretary of ſtate under Licinius, in 323 at the lateſt, ſhould be ſtill alive in 375. But it may be ſaid, that the acts of S. Nicetas ſpeak of a ſecond Auxentius,] λ who was likewiſe Biſhop of Mopſueſtia about the end of the Vth century.

ν *Bar.* 18. *dec. f.* 15. *ſept. p.* 152. §. 6. *G. p.* 516. 2. *c.*

θ *Suid. t.* 1. *p.* 492.

κ §. 4, 5. *p.* 151.

λ *Sur. Thdrt.*

[We must certainly refer to the first Auxentius what Philostorgius says,] μ that he kindly entertain'd Aëtius who was banish'd to Mopsuestia in 360, ἐς τὰ μάλιστα φιλοφροσύνης ἀξιῶται. [This gives some ground to believe, that their doctrine was not very opposite; and yet it is allowable to have some humanity for the most wicked people, especially when they are in trouble. But it must be observ'd, that all that we have to Auxentius's advantage, comes from Suidas. For the encomiums of Metaphrastes, if he speaks of him, go for nothing:] ν and it is not doubted but Suidas, [who borrows a good deal from Philostorgius,] borrow'd this passage from him likewise. For we find that in it he calls the Bishops *Ephori*, which is a term little known or rather entirely unknown in the Church, ξ and which Philostorgius makes use of in several places. Afterwards in the same passage Aëtius and Eunomius are mention'd to advantage; [which is never done but by Philostorgius or some other such like Eunomians.

So that it cannot be doubted but Baronius would have corrected this passage of his martyrology with that of S. Xynorida, if he had known that all that is said in praise of Auxentius, serves only to make us believe that he was an Arian, and even a partisan of Aëtius: And this is confirm'd by the judgment even of his own Church. For it is observable,] ο that in Justinian's time Auxentius's name was not in the diptychs of the Church of Mopsuestia, any more than that of Macedonius [his predecessor, whom the Arians made a Confessor likewise.] Before Olympius, [who assisted in 381 at the Council of Constantinople,] there are only Protogenes and Zosimus.

NOTE LXXV. referr'd to in §. 99. p. 342.

The time of Eunomius's banishment.

π SOcrates places the banishment of Eunomius, the place of which he does not mention, among the things which happen'd between the death of Gratian in 383 and Theodosius's return to Constantinople [in 391:] and he does not speak of it till even after the demolition of the temple of Serapis [in 389.] ρ But S. Gregory Nazianzen declares, that he was in Cappadocia when he wrote to Nectarius about him; [and by consequence before 389, in which year S. Gregory died.] σ Philostorgius places it between the death of Gratian τ and Theodosius's marriage with Galla, υ which happen'd in the year 386 according to Marcellinus, and in the year 387 according to Baronius.

μ *Phisg. l.* 5. *c.* 2. *p.* 78. ν *n. V. p.* 140. 2. *d.* ξ *Phisg. l.* 9. *c.* 8. *p.* 126. | *l.* 3. *c.* 12. *p.* 46. ο *Conc. t.* 5. *p.* 495. *a.* π *Socr. l.* 5. *c.* 20. *p.* 280. *a.* ρ *Naz. or.* 46. *p.* 721. *c.* σ *Phisg. l.* 10. *c.* 5. *p.* 137. τ *c.* 7. *p.* 138, 139. υ *Bar.* 387. §. 57.

NOTE

NOTE LXXVI. referr'd to in §. 101. p. 352.

What may be thought of the depoſition of Euzoïus Biſhop of Antioch, as it is related in S. Athanaſius.

Φ WE find in S. Athanaſius, that Euzoïus was depos'd after he was fix'd in the biſhoprick of Antioch: [If this is to be underſtood of Conſtantius's reign and becauſe of the Arian hereſy, we ſee no way of explaining this depoſition, but by ſaying that S. Meletius made ſome proteſtation againſt his intruſion, and declar'd him anathema. For there is no probability that he was depos'd by a Council, conſidering how few months Conſtantius, who gave him this dignity, liv'd afterwards.

But if theſe terms of S. Athanaſius are taken in a more general ſenſe, it is poſſible enough that the Council of Antioch in Jovian's reign, in which Acacius of Cæſarea ſign'd the Conſubſtantiality, made likewiſe ſome decree againſt Euzoïus, in favour of S. Meletius, and to juſtify the great number of Orthodox people who had left Euzoïus's communion. It may be that even the Arians in the quarrels that happen'd ſo often among them, might pronounce ſome ſentence of depoſition againſt him, tho' in all likelihood it had no effect.]

NOTE LXXVII. referr'd to in §. 110. p. 353.

That it was not S. Meletius, who ſeparated the Orthodox from the Arians.

[S. Chryſoſtom gives ſome ground to ſay, that S. Meletius himſelf ſeparated the Orthodox from the Arians before he was baniſh'd,] χ when he ſays that he cut off from the body of the Church the corrupt and unprofitable members. [But this is not expreſs enough to oppoſe] ↓ to Theodorit and the others, who ſay that the Catholicks did not ſeparate from the Arians till after the baniſhment of S. Meletius and Euzoïus's intruſion.

Φ *Ath. de ſyn. p.* 907. *a.* χ *Chry. t.* 1. *or.* 45. *p.* 524. *e.* ↓ *Thdrt. l.* 2. *c.* 27. *p.* 635. *c.* | *l.* 3. *c.* 2. *p.* 639. *c, d.* | *ep.* 112. *p.* 98. 2. *d.* | *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 24. *p.* 247. | *Socr. l.* 2. *c.* 44. *p.* 158. *a.* | *Soz. l.* 4. *c.* 28. *p.* 588. *b.*

NOTE

NOTE LXXVIII. referr'd to in §. 102. p. 354.

Upon the name of Exacionites or Exocionites given to the Arians.

ω GOthofred pretends that Theodorit is miſtaken, when he ſays that the Arians who were call'd Exacionites or Exocionites, took this name from the place where they met; and he will have it that this name is the ſame with that of Exoucontians given likewiſe to the Arians, becauſe they ſaid that the Son ſprang out of nothing, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. Gothofred grounds this upon his own authority, [which does not at all appear to us to be great enough to allow us to charge ſo accurate a man as Theodorit with error.] α We ſee in Mr. du Cange, who has follow'd Theodorit, that there was in reality at Conſtantinople, out of the city, a place or quarter call'd *Exocionium* or *Exacionium*, which is often mention'd in hiſtory; and in the ſame author we meet alſo with the reaſon which the modern Greeks give for this name.

NOTE LXXIX. referr'd to in §. 105. p. 366.

That it is not to be imagin'd how the Macedonians could deſire Jovian to let the Council of Ariminum ſtand in force.

β THE Macedonians or Semiarians deſir'd Jovian, according to Sozomen, to confirm what had been done at Ariminum and Seleucia. [We do not underſtand this requeſt with regard to the Council of Ariminum, where the word Subſtance was aboliſh'd which was maintain'd by the Macedonians, and the confeſſion of which ſynod had been rejected by them in the Council of Seleucia, and embrac'd by the pure Arians their adverſaries. We know not what to ſay upon this; but we thought it better not to mention Ariminum at all in the text.]

ω *Phiſg. n. p.* 406. | *Thdrt. hær. l.* 5. *c.* 3. *p.* 237. *d.* α *Cang. de C. l.* 2. *p.* 171, 172. β *Soz. l.* 6. *c.* 4. *p.* 641. *a.*

NOTE

NOTE LXXX. referr'd to in §. 105. p. 369.

That the Council of Lampſacus was held in 365, *&c.*

γ SOzomen ſays, that when Hypatian came to Valentinian in the name of thoſe who held the Son to be conſubſtantial with the Father, ὁμοούσιον, this prince who had already left Conſtantinople to go into the Weſt, told him that he would not meddle in religious affairs, but that the Biſhops might meet together whenever they pleas'd; and it was upon this, adds Sozomen, that the Council of Lampſacus was aſſembled. δ Now it is agreed that the Council of Lampſacus was held by the Macedonians, who did not maintain the Conſubſtantiality; and this gives ground to believe, that inſtead of ὁμοούσιον, it ſhould be read ὁμοιούσιον, which was a proper word for the Macedonians.

[But beſides this there is another difficulty in this paſſage. For tho' the anſwer which Sozomen makes Valentinian give, agrees perfectly well with his character, yet it is difficult to believe that it was he who allow'd the Council of Lampſacus to meet. He left Conſtantinople in May, and gave the Eaſtern Empire to his brother, when he was at Naïſſus in Dacia in June ι or July 364. It muſt be therefore in June or July when he allow'd the Council to meet; and if the caſe be ſo, the Council was held without doubt in the ſame year 364.] ε And indeed Sozomen ſays, that the Biſhops of the Council came to make their report of it to Valens, when he return'd from Thrace, where he had been to accompany his brother; [which was certainly in the year 364.

ι See his title, §. 9.

And yet we cannot doubt but the Council was held in 365,] ζ ſince Socrates fixes it to that year, both by the epocha of the Conſulate of the two princes, and becauſe he ſays it was the ſeventh year after the Council of Seleucia, [which was held in the year 359. Nay, Sozomen himſelf ſeems to ſhew the ſame thing,] η for he ſays that after the defeat of Procopius [in 366,] Valens puniſh'd the Biſhops of the Council of Lampſacus, [whereas if they had held it in 364, he had had leiſure enough to perſecute them before the revolt of Procopius,] θ which happen'd upon the 28th of September in 365. [There is no reaſon therefore to doubt but we muſt follow Socrates as to the time of this Council's being held, and place it about July, Auguſt, and September in the ſame year 365 · and if ſo, it ſeems difficult to believe that it was allow'd to meet above a year before.

γ *Soz. l. 6. c. 7. p. 646. a, b.* δ *n. p. 139. 1, 2.* ε *l. 6. c. 7. p. 647. a, b.* ζ *Socr. l. 4. c. 4. p. 213. a, b.* η *Soz. l. 6. c. 8. p. 648. b.* θ *Idat.*

But

But as the answer ascrib'd to Valentinian by Sozomen is entirely suitable to the character of this prince, it may very well be that the Semiarians might come to speak to him about the affairs of the Church before he left the East; that they might likewise come to speak to Valens when he return'd from accompanying his brother at the end of the same year 364; and that upon the same occasion or a few months after,] ι they might obtain of him, as Socrates tells it, permission to hold the Council of Lampsacus. [This is what we have follow'd in the text.]

NOTE LXXXI. referr'd to in §. 107. p. 377.

That the persecution of the Church of Cæsarea by Valens must be plac'd in the year 366.

[] IT seems as if we should place in the year 365 the persecution of the Church of Cæsarea, which oblig'd Eusebius the Bishop of the place to be reconcil'd with S. Basil,] κ for Valens came to Cæsarea at that time, λ and pass'd part of the summer there. [But on the other hand it seems difficult to think, that so early as the year 365 he should be so irritated against the Catholicks, as S. Gregory Nazianzen represents him upon this occasion. At least he was not yet much incens'd against the Macedonians,] μ who were more criminal than the Catholicks in the opinion of the Arians, [since he allow'd them to hold their Council at Lampsacus:] ν And as to what Socrates and Sozomen say of the persecution which he rais'd at that time against the Catholicks of Antioch, [that appears either false or very doubtful, since they suppose that Valens was then at Antioch, which is absolutely impossible, according to Ammianus.] ξ On the contrary, according to the same authors, he persecuted the Macedonians very cruelly after the death of Procopius, [that is in the year 366,] and in general all those who did not follow Arianism as he did. ο This is observ'd of the Catholicks of Constantinople in particular. [It is this which has induc'd us to place the persecution of those of Cæsarea at this time likewise, not being able to place it later, for the reasons which we shall give in the notes upon S. Basil. And if we do not find that Valens went to Cæsarea in 366, neither do we find that he did not go thither: and Ammianus does not profess to take notice of all his journeys.]

ι *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 2. *p.* 211, 212. κ *Naz. or.* 20. *p.* 338. *b.*
λ *Amm. l.* 26. *p.* 322. μ *Soz. l.* 6. *c.* 10. *p.* 650. *a*, *b.* ν *c.* 7. *p.* 647. *c.* | *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 2. *p.* 212. *a*, *b.* ξ *Soz. l.* 6. *c.* 8. *p.* 648. *b.* ο *c.* 9. *p.* 649. *a.* | *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 9. *p.* 217. *d.*

NOTE

NOTE LXXXII. referr'd to in §. 169. p. 383.

The time of Pope Liberius's death.

τ AS Juvencus Præfect of Rome had a great hand in what pass'd between Damasus and Ursinus after the death of Pope Liberius, ρ and as some rescripts which are directed to him, shew that he held that office in 367, σ Baronius thought that upon this account the death of Pope Liberius should be plac'd in the same year, whereas according to S. Jerom it happen'd in 366; and Marcellinus and Faustinus the Priests p. 4, 5, place it positively upon the 24th of September the same year, τ which Papebrook has follow'd. [However Baronius's reason is nothing against so strong an authority. For as the troubles which follow'd upon Liberius's death, lasted a whole year, they may have happen'd under more than one Præfect; besides that Juvencus might be Præfect in 366 and 367, and indeed we are oblig'd to say he was, for] Marcellinus the Priest who was upon the spot, assures us p. 6, 7, that Juvencus was Præfect before the 26th of October 366. υ Besides, according to the Code, Pretextatus must have succeeded Juvencus as early as August 367, φ and yet Baronius does not place the death of Liberius till in September. So that it is easy to reconcile the Code with S. Jerom and Marcellinus, by making Juvencus begin his office from the end of 366. But if that cannot be according to the Code, we must without doubt prefer the authority of Marcellinus, who wrote what he saw with his eyes, before that of the Code which is known to be full of faults as to inscriptions and dates. If its authority is receiv'd, we find that Julian the Purveyor General, who had likewise an hand in the beginning of the schism, χ was in his office in June 366.

[All the difficulty that may remain then as to the death of Liberius, and which is not of much importance, is to know whether it must be plac'd upon the 24th of September, VIII *kal. oct.* as it is read in Marcelliuus, or whether it should not be read VIIII. *kal.*] ψ since the martyrologies of the IXth century, and those of S. Jerom, for the most part place his festival upon the 23d of September. There are some of them however that place it upon the 24th: ω Papebrook is for the 23d.

τ *Amm. l.* 26. *p.* 315. *b.* | *l.* 27. *p.* 337. *c.* ρ *Bar.* 367. §. 2, 3. σ §. 4. τ *Boll. prop. p.* 51. *c.* υ *Cod. Th. chr. p.* 79. φ *Bar.* 367. §. 5. χ *Cod. Th.* 14. *t.* 15. *l.* 2. *p.* 452. ψ *Florent. p.* 854. 2. ω *Boll. prop. p.* 51. *f.*

NOTE

NOTE LXXXIII. referr'd to in §. 109. p. 383.

Upon the foundation of the Church of Liberius or Santa Maria Maggiore.

[WE do not relate here] α the miracles which are pretended to have happen'd at the foundation of the Church of Liberius or Santa Maria Maggiore, because they are founded upon nothing but lessons in the Breviary, which contain many stories that have little probability in them, some of which they were even oblig'd to leave out in the last Roman Breviaries, [and which were not written till since the Popes pass'd for Monarchs and Kings :] *Tempore quo Liberius Papa Apostolicæ sedis regnum obtinebat.* [If there is any truth in this, it seems better to refer it to the repairing of this Church under Sixtus III,] β who is thought to have enlarg'd it very much, and to have first dedicated it under the name of the Blessed Virgin.

γ Some think, that the Church where Ursinus was elected Pope in opposition to Damasus, is the same with that of Liberius, because they are both plac'd in the quarter call'd *Exquiliæ*, near Livia market, δ and that Ursinus's party kept the Church of Liberius ; [and it is not difficult to think, that one and the same Church should bear the name of Sicinius who might have built it first, and that of Liberius who had rebuilt or alter'd it, and had made a Church of it.] ε Others choose rather to believe, that they are two different and neighbouring Churches.

NOTE LXXXIV. referr'd to in §. 110. p. 385.

That the legates of the Macedonians went into Gaul, &c. to desire communicatory letters.

ζ BARONIUS says, that upon the deputation of Eustathius, Liberius sent legates into Gaul and the other provinces of the West, to assure the Faithful there that the Easterns were return'd to the faith and the Catholick Church ; η and it is to this that he ascribes the letters from the Bishops of Italy, Gaul, Africa, and Sicily, which Eustathius and the other deputies from

α *Florent. p.* 731. β *p.* 729. γ *p.* 732. δ *Mar. & F. p.* 6, 7. ε *Flor. p.* 730. ζ *Bar.* 365. §. 16. η *Soz. l.* 6. *c.* 12. *p.* 652. *c.*

the

the Easterns carried with them. [We do not meet with any proof of the Pope's sending legates upon this occasion: And it is much more natural to think, that the deputies from the Easterns went themselves to desire these letters, of which they were the bearers.] θ This is even certain with regard to Sicily, [and more than probable as to Italy, for they spent some time at Rome.]

NOTE LXXXV. referr'd to in §. 111. p. 388.

That they are the decrees of the Bishops of Asia rather than of the West, which the Council of Tyanæ recommends to be read.

[WHAT we say that the Council of Tyanæ recommended the decrees of the Bishops of Asia to be read, is according to Christopherson's edition. But instead of τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, which is read in the text of Christopherson, *p.* 316. *a*, the margin of the same edition and Valesius's edition *p.* 652. *c*, read τῶν ἀνὰ τὴν δύσιν, which is only a repetition or rather an anticipation of what follows. The Tripartite history *l.* 7. *c.* 28. *p.* 106. *a*, has *apud Asiam*; and the Latin of Nicephorus (for the Greek is wanting in this place) has likewise *Asiaticorum*. The word ψήφισμα agrees very well with the Councils of Asia, which had sent deputies into the West.]

NOTE LXXXVI. referr'd to in §. 111. p. 390.

That the Council of Illyricum authoriz'd by a law of Valentinian's, might probably be held in the year 375.

BARONIUS places in the year 365 the letter of the Council of Illyricum which Theodorit has preserv'd, together with the law of Valentinian which is join'd to it. [This may be supported by what Theodorit says,] κ that we see by it that Valens held then the principles of the true faith. λ For he fell into Arianism, according to Theodorit himself, when he was baptiz'd by Eudoxius upon the account of the war with the Goths, [that is, about the beginning of the year 367. On the other

θ *b.* | *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 12. *p.* 224. *c*, *d.* 25. ι *Bar.* 365. §. 16, κ *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 7. *p.* 667. *c.* λ *c.* 11. *p.* 674.

hand

hand however, it would be eaſy to ſhew by this very law of Valentinian's, that Valens perſecuted the Catholicks at that time;] μ and Theodorit does not place it till after having ſpoken of the election of S. Ambroſe, [at the end of the year 374, tho' he does not ſay that it was not made till after that.] ν Neither will Baronius found his chronology upon Theodorit, but upon other reaſons, [which we do not ſet down, becauſe they are refuted by the courſe of the hiſtory itſelf.] ξ And whatever they may be, they cannot be heard, ſince the law bears Gratian's name at the head of it, who was not made Auguſtus till the 24th of Auguſt in the year 367. ο It is true, Baronius has not put down Gratian's name in his tranſlation. But it is in the Greek text, in Nicephorus *l.* 11. *c.* 30. *p.* 167. *b*, and in the Tripartite hiſtory *l.* 7. *c.* 9. *p.* 98. *c.* π And what farther ſhews the alteration of the text by Baronius, is that contrary to the ſame authorities [and the inviolable cuſtom of the Romans,] he places the name of Valens before that of Valentinian, who was the elder Auguſtus.

[It is certain then that the law is poſterior to the 24th of Auguſt 367, but how much is not eaſy to ſay. It is but a very little in all likelihood, if Euſtathius whom the Council of Illyricum mentions, is him of Sebaſtia, as every body believes.] ρ He was indeed a Biſhop acquainted with what paſs'd in Aſia: [And it is eaſy to ſuppoſe, that Euſtathius of Sebaſtia came into Illyricum about the end of 366. So that as the letter from the Council is written upon what they had learnt of the ſtate of Aſia from Euſtathius, it muſt without doubt be plac'd in the end of 367.] σ Blondel places it a year later, becauſe he pretends that Valentinian had juſt finiſh'd the year 368 in Illyricum; [but this is nothing, for we hope to ſhew in Note XXXV upon Valentinian, that he was then at Treves.

But I do not ſee that it is neceſſary to ſay, that Euſtathius mention'd by the Council of Illyricum, is him of Sebaſtia.] τ What they learnt from this Euſtathius, was that all Aſia ſeparated the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son, not acknowledging him to be conſubſtantial with them. υ Now is there any likelihood, as Valeſius obſerves, that Euſtathius of Sebaſtia ſhould accuſe the Macedonians of this hereſy, in which he was engag'd himſelf, eſpecially when he was deputed by the Macedonians to bring about an union between them and the Catholicks of the Eaſt? He certainly conceal'd this error as much as he could; [and without that, he, and Silvanus, and Theophilus his brother-deputies, would not have been receiv'd as Catholicks at Rome and in the reſt of the Weſt. All that can be ſaid, is that when he came into Illyricum, he was oblig'd to acknowledge that he was in this error, and that it

μ *c.* 6, 7. *p.* 667. ν *Bar.* 365. §. 16. ξ *Thdrt.* *n. p.* 33. 1. *c, d.* ο *Bar.* 365. §. 20. π *Thdrt. n.* *p.* 32. 1. *a.* ρ *l.* 4. *c.* 8. *p.* 670. *d.* σ *Blond. prim.* *p.* 133. τ *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 8. *p.* 670. *a, d.* υ *p.* 33. 2. *d.*

was

was the general belief of Asia. But this is not the account that the letter of the Council of Illyricum gives us; and they would not bestow the title of Lord and brother upon a man, whom they should have rejected with execration, as engag'd in a dangerous error,] φ besides what they had to reproach him with that was pass'd.

[So that it seems natural enough to believe, that this Eustathius was some Bishop of Illyricum, who having pass'd thro' Asia, either to go to Jerusalem to visit the holy places, or upon some other occasion, had reported the deplorable state of that province. If it is said, that so long a journey did not agree with a Bishop, he might not have been ordain'd Bishop till after his return, as S. Gaudentius of Bresse, and he might be even only a Priest,] χ since the same letter gives the title of Lord and collegue to Elpidius the Priest.

[Being then no longer oblig'd to bring ourselves as near as can be to the year 366, if this Eustathius is not him of Sebastia,] ψ it seems better to place the Council in the time that Valentinian was in Illyricum, [and by consequence bring it as low as the year 375.] ω For other Councils being held at the same time at Rome and in Gaul, [where Valentinian almost always was,] α we do not see why Valentinian should by his law authorize that of Illyricum rather than the others, if he had been in another country. β Valesius believes, that it is posterior to the epistle of Pope Damasus to the Bishops of Illyricum, [which in all likelihood was not written so soon.] γ We find likewise, that this Council condemns six Arian Bishops, and it seems as the only ones that were then in Illyricum: [and among these six, we do not meet either with Valens, who appears to have liv'd till 371,] δ or with any of the thirty others, who are mention'd in 366 in the difference between Germinius and the other Arians. [It may be objected to this last reason, that Palladius and Secundianus who were still alive in 381, are not in the number of the six. But we have no very certain proof that they were already Bishops in 375. The law of Valentinian which authorizes the Council, should have given peace to the Church of the East: And yet we meet with nothing less than this in history; and there is no reason to be surpriz'd at it, if Valentinian was dead before perhaps it was publish'd.]

φ *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 12. *p.* 220. *a.* χ *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 8. *p.* 669. *d.* 670. *b, d.* ψ *Blond. prim. p.* 133. ω *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 7. *p.* 669. *a.* α *Bar.* 365. §. 24. β *Thdrt. n. p.* 34. 2. *a.* γ *l.* 4. *c.* 8. *p.* 671, *a.* δ *Hil. fr.* 1. *p.* 41.

NOTE LXXXVII. referr'd to in §. 112. p. 391.

Upon the time of the history of S. Bretanio, and upon his name.

ε THeodorit places the history of S. Bretanio quite at the end of Valens's reign, and immediately before his defeat and death, [that is in 378. But there is no likelihood, that Valens should then have leisure to go to Tomi.]

ζ Valesius chooses to call this Saint Vetranio, tho' all the authors that mention him, give him the name of Bretanio. He pretends that the word Vetranio is more etymological, and that the Saint's name is the same with that of the Vetranio who put on and laid down the purple in 350. [What he says, may be true: but that does not make it worth while to be singular, and oblig'd to make an apology.]

NOTE LXXXVIII. referr'd to in §. 114. p. 398.

Upon Demophilus, who was made Bishop of Constantinople by the Arians.

η SOcrates and Sozomen say nothing in particular of Demophilus who was made Bishop of Constantinople by the Arians, after the death of Eudoxius. [So that according to them, he might possibly be] θ him whom S. Epiphanius makes a disciple of Aëtius, and a companion in impiety and banishment with Eunomius and Hypatius, and who he says had been protected and prefer'd by Eudoxius: [which does not agree with Demophilus of Berea in Thrace, famous in Constantius's reign for having persecuted Liberius and made him fall; for we do not find that this Demophilus was banish'd, nor that he had any occasion to make use of Eudoxius's protection and authority. And it appears that he was Bishop as early as the year 345, when people had not begun ι to speak of Aëtius.]

ι See §. 38.

ι But he of Constantinople [was so far from appearing an Eunomian,] that on the contrary he was very opposite to that sect: κ And Theodorit says positively, that he is the same with him who was before at Berea in Thrace. [It is plain likewise, that Philostorgius was of the same opinion:] λ For he says that he

ε *Thdrt. l. 4. c. 31. p. 703.* ζ *Soz. n. p. 142. 2. a.* η *Socr. l. 4. c. 14. p. 226. a.* | *Soz. l. 6. c. 13. p. 655. b.* θ *Epi. 73. c. 38. p. 886. b.* ι *Phisg. l. 9. c. 14. p. 129.* κ *Thdrt. l. 5. c. 39. p. 756.* λ *Phisg. l. 9. c. 8. p. 126.*

was

was translated from Berea, μ and that being turn'd out of Constantinople by Theodosius, he retir'd to his city of Berea; and that it might not be thought that he calls it his city, because he was originally of it, ν he says that Thessalonica was his native country. [It is clear then that he thought that he had at first been Bishop of Berea. But he would not perhaps persuade us to it without the authority of Theodorit, since he seems to be mistaken, when he says that he retir'd to Berea in Theodosius's reign.] ξ For, according to Socrates and Sozomen, he continued till his death near Constantinople, carrying himself always as a Bishop among his own sect.

NOTE LXXXIX. referr'd to in §. 114. p. 399.

A passage of Philostorgius not well corrected by his translators.

PHilostorgius says, that Demophilus was made Bishop of Constantinople, Οὐάλεντ⊙ τῆ βασιλέως συνοδικῆ ἐπιχειροτονίᾳ ψήφου. [I do not see that this can signify any thing but that] Valens pretended the suffrage of a synod, that is, that he caus'd it to be publish'd, that the instalment of Demophilus was authoriz'd by a synod, tho' there had been never an one, or at most he had only got a tumultuous assembly together, which was not a lawful synod. And this agrees very well with what we read at the end of Theodorit's history, according to Father Sirmondus's edition *p.* 756, that Demophilus translated himself from Berea to Constantinople; and with what Philostorgius says,] π that at his instalment, many people cried out, *He is not worthy.* And yet Gothofred renders the words we have cited thus, *Imperatore Synodicam probante ordinationem*, without giving any reason for this translation. Valesius translates it in the same manner *p.* 519. *a.* But in his notes *p.* 148. 2. *a*, to make out this sense, he will have ἐπιχειροτονίᾳ chang'd into ἐπικειμονίᾳ. [I think that ἐπιχειροτονέω signifies rather to judge over again, than to confirm: but it is enough for us that this correction, which is not authoriz'd, is not at all necessary, the text as it is bearing a very good sense in my opinion. What we have cited from Theodorit, is not in Valesius's edition *p.* 249. *d.* But this is a thing which will be more easily presum'd to have been omitted in some manuscripts, than to have been added in others.]

μ *c.* 19. *p.* 133. ν *c.* 14. *p.* 129. ξ *Socr. l.* 5. *c.* 7. *p.* 263. *d.* | *c.* 12. *p.* 271. *c.* | *Soz. l.* 7. *c.* 5. *p.* 709. *c.* | *c.* 14. *p.* 722. *c.* ο *Phisg. l.* 9. *c.* 8. *p.* 126. π *c.* 10. *p.* 127

NOTE XC. referr'd to in §. 114. p. 399.

Upon Dorotheus of Heraclea, call'd likewiſe Theodorus.

ρ HE who inthron'd Demophilus, was Theodorus of Heraclea, according to Philoſtorgius. [It is plain that he is the ſame with him whom that author calls every where elſe Dorotheus, whether it was that he gave him a wrong name in calling him Theodorus, or whether he had both thoſe names:] σ For indeed Sozomen gives him likewiſe both. τ Socrates calls him only Dorotheus, υ and Valeſius thinks that is his true name. [We do not give him any other in the text, that he may be the more eaſily diſtinguiſh'd from the famous Theodorus Biſhop of the ſame city of Heraclea in the reigns of Conſtantine and Conſtantius, who was dead in the year 355, and had Hypatian for his ſucceſſor.]

NOTE XCI. referr'd to in §. 122. p. 430.

The time of Peter of Alexandria's retiring to Rome.

φ THeodorit ſeems to have thought, that Peter of Alexandria left Egypt to go to Rome before Lucius arriv'd. [He ſeems to have taken this opinion] χ from what Peter ſays in his letter; that he had retir'd before Lucius came. [But he might withdraw from the epiſcopal palace and out of the ſight of his people, to hide himſelf in Alexandria or in the neighbouring country for ſome time, and to have been a witneſs of what he relates in the ſequel of his letter, as is probable enough,] ↓ ſince S. Gregory Nazianzen ſays, that when he came to Rome, he repreſented there the dreadful tragedy which had been acted in the Eaſt; [and this is what we muſt follow, if we will allow that he was ſome time a priſoner, as Socrates and Sozomen ſay he was.] ω And if it is he, as we believe it is, who is mention'd in Ammonius's relation of the martyrdom of the ſolitaries

ρ *Phiſg. l. 9. c. 10. p. 127.*
b. | *l. 7. c. 14. p. 722. d.*
υ *n. p. 148. 2. a.* | *Thdrt. n. p. 148, 149.*
18. p. 685. b. χ *c. 19. p. 688. d.*
p. 418. d. ω *Combf. act. p. 88.*
σ *Soz. l. 6. c. 37. p. 699.*
τ *Socr. l. 5. c. 3. p. 260. d.*
φ *Thdrt. l. 2. c.*
↓ *Naz. or. 23.*

of

of Sinaï and Raïthus, [it is plain that he did not retire immediately to Rome,] but that he continued for ſome time incognito, being oblig'd to fly to ſeveral places. α Valeſius thinks, that there was a conſiderable time between Peter's ordination and his retreat to Rome, ſince he receiv'd letters in Egypt from Pope Damaſus. He is even of opinion, that his retreat ſhould be plac'd in the year after his epiſcopate: [which we would follow without any difficulty, if we met with any poſitive authority for it among the ancients.]

NOTE XCII. referr'd to in §. 127. p. 446.

Whether Carophrygia is an error for Caria and Phrygia.

β THE title of the epiſtle from the Council of Illyricum and of Valentinian's letter which is join'd with it, runs thus: *To the Biſhops of the dioceſe of Aſia, Phrygia, Carophrygia, and Pacatiana.* γ Blondel and Valeſius will change Carophrygia, which they confeſs notwithſtanding is to be met with in all the copies, in the Tripartite hiſtory *l.* 7. *c.* 9, 10. *p.* 98, 99, and in Nicephorus; and they read *of Caria and Phrygia Pacatiana.* [This may have ſome probability, but no certainty;] and what Blondel thinks, that the Council of Illyricum was held upon the account of that of Caria [in 367, can be no more than a meer conjecture, which falls of courſe, if that of Illyricum was not held, as it was not [1] according to our opinion, till 375. It is hard that a word muſt be chang'd, which is found in all the copies of two different pieces, tho' it could not proceed, if it is wrong, from any thing but a pure miſtake of the tranſcriber, and not from a falſe correction made with deſign. For if there never had been any Carophrygia, how ſhould they think of ſubſtituting this name in the room of thoſe of Caria and Phrygia, which have always been very well known?

[1] See Note 86.

So that there is all the reaſon in the world to believe, that there was then a country call'd Carophrygia, becauſe it contain'd that part of Phrygia which is neareſt Caria, or the borders of both, whether it was that it was no province and particular government, or whether it was one newly erected by Valens, as Cappadocia ſecunda and Lycaonia, but diſſolv'd immediately after, and re-eſtabliſh'd a long time afterwards under the title of Pacatiana ſecunda, which had Hierapolis for its capital city. Let it be either of theſe ways, we cannot wonder much, if authors have not mention'd this Carophrygia. Theodorit favours this opinion very much,] δ when he ſays that the Em-

α *Thdrt. n. p.* 38. 1. *b.* *c.* | 669. *c, d.* *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 7. *p.* 667. *b.*

β *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 7, 8. *p.* 667.

γ *n. p.* 32. 1. *b, c.* | *Blond. prim. p.* 129.

peror wrote to those of Asia and Phrygia, [without mentioning Caria:] Theophanes does the same thing *p.* 52. *b.* [I meet with none but the Synodicon] ε that says the Council sent their Tome, and Valentinian his edict, into Asia, Caria, and Phrygia, to the Arian Bishops.

NOTE XCIII. referr'd to in §. 127. p. 446.

What persons the Council of Illyricum would have elected to the episcopate and the other orders.

ζ THese words of the Council of Illyricum to the Churches of Asia, ἐν ᾧ ἐν τέλει χρησαμῷῳ ὑγιεῖ, as Father Sirmondus has put them, or ἐν ᾧ ἐν τέλει χρησαμῷων ἐπισκόπων ὑγιῶς, according to Valesius's edition *p.* 161. *c*, are very obscure, and it is easier to reject the sense which others put upon them, than to find out a good one. [I think there are some who pretend, that the Council would have those elected to the episcopate, above all others, who have been in places and offices of magistracy. But is not this the thing in the world the most contrary to all the Canons and to this very Council, which immediately after excludes those who have been in the Senate and Common Council of the city, and those who have been engag'd in any military office: this takes in all those of the Court, and by consequence all those of the empire, excepting the offices of judicature, which generally speaking were bestow'd upon Senators.]

η Valesius thinks that the sense of this passage is, that they must choose immediately the children of the preceding Bishops, if there were any without reproach. This sense is easily enough found in the text by taking away ἐν. [But it was not so common a thing to see among the Clergy (for the Council certainly understood it of no other people) Bishops children, as it is easy to believe the Council had a view towards them: and Valesius, who is pretty well vers'd in history, met with no instance of it but Domnus I. of Antioch. I would make it comprehend at least the nephews and other relations of the deceas'd Bishops, educated under his care, since the word *son* is not in the text, if it were not difficult to believe that the Council would favour the disorder of mitred families, according to S. Bernard's expression, and the dangerous practice of those who out of nothing but worldly interest would perpetuate the goods and dignities of the Church in their own families: or else we must say, that as there was no such disorder at that time, the Council had no

ε *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 837. *e.* ζ *Theodrt. l.* 4. *c.* 8. *p.* 670. *c.*
η *n. p.* 34. 1. *d.*

regard

regard to it, and consider'd nothing but the peace of the Churches, and the uniformity of discipline, which is more easily preserv'd by persons educated under one another in the same mind and spirit, and whom people are us'd to respect upon the account of those to whom they belong.]

Eustathius in the Tripartite history *l.* 7. *c.* 10. *p.* 99. *b*, makes it said to the Council, that wicked Bishops should be depos'd, and even depriv'd of the order of Priests; [which is properly speaking saying nothing; and this sense cannot be found in the Greek.]

NOTE XCIV. referr'd to in §. 128. p. 446.

That Elpidius, who carried the epistle of the Council of Illyricum, was sent thither by the Emperor rather than by the Pope, &c.

θ BAronius pretends, that Elpidius, who was sent into Asia by the Council of Illyricum, was a Priest of Rome and the Pope's legate, sent by him into Illyricum and Asia. ι Valesius gives several reasons against this opinion. [And I think it is sufficient for that to observe, that in all likelihood Baronius took what he says from nothing but the letter of the Council of Illyricum,] κ which runs thus, according to his translation, *Elpidium cum litteris Româ, quæ est caput imperii, ad vos mittere, &c.* λ But the Greek has ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλευούσης Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς, [which seems to signify that Elpidius was sent in the name of the Emperor.] This is the sense which Eustathius in the Tripartite history *p.* 99. *b*, and Father Sirmondus have taken, [and I know not why.] μ Valesius pretends that it is insupportable.

[It should not have been observ'd that Elpidius was of Rome, if he was a Bishop, since Councils do not mind putting down the place of a man's birth; and all the dignities which he might have had at Rome, were lost and swallow'd up by the eminence of the episcopate.] ν And Valesius thinks that, according to this passage, it must be said that he was no more than a Priest of Rome. ξ But a column before he had enlarg'd very much, to shew that he was neither Priest nor legate of Rome, but that he was certainly Bishop of Illyricum; *aperte declaratur*: And he gives strong reasons, but such as do not seem to us to be sufficient to remove the objection taken from the title of Priest, which is expressly given to Elpidius. ο Valesius says that one manuscript has πρεσβύτης. But this word does not

θ *Bar.* 365. §. 16. ι *Tkdr.. n. p.* 33. 2. *a.* κ *Bar.* 365. §. 17. λ *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 8. *p.* 670. *b.* μ *Thdrt. n. p.* 34. 1. *a.* ν *a.* ξ *p.* 33. 2. *a, b, c.* ο *b.*

make

make ſenſe in this place: and beſides the other manuſcripts, Nicephorus *l.* 11. *c.* 30. *p.* 169, and Euſtathius himſelf have read πρεσβυτέρᾳ. [So that it does not go ſo much againſt us to believe that Elpidius was a Prieſt of Rome and the Pope's legate, ſince he may have been at the ſame time legate both from the Pope and the Council of Illyricum; but we dare not ſay this, becauſe we ſee no proof of it, τῇ βασιλίδι τῶν Ρωμαίων ἀρχῇ, appearing to us to mean rather the Emperor than the Pope;] π beſides that it is certain Valentinian fortified the decrees of the Council of Illyricum with his authority, and wrote to the ſame Churches as the Council did.

NOTE XCV. referr'd to in §. 129. p. 450.

That the Council of Laodicea is not that of Theodoſius of Philadelphia and the other Arians, held in 363.

ρ THERE was in Valens's time one Theodotus or Theodoſius of Philadelphia in Lydia, who was one of the moſt wicked and abandon'd wretches among the Arians. Gothofred will have it that he not only aſſiſted at the Council of Laodicea, σ but even that this Council was that which this Theodoſius and the other Arians of Eudoxius's communion held in the beginning of Jovian's reign in 363. [But he grounds a point of this importance, and which would entirely diſhonour this Council, upon nothing but the weakeſt conjectures in the world, and the chief foundation of which is falſe. I do not know whether Blondel had a mind to follow the ſame opinion,] τ by placing it in 362; but he does it without giving any proof of it.

NOTE XCVI. referr'd to in §. 130. p. 451.

Who Biſhop Hypſius was, who was depos'd by the Mock-Council or conciliabulum *of Galatia.*

υ BLondel will have it, that Hythius, who is nam'd the firſt in Liberius's letter to the Eaſterns [in 366,] is Hypſius depos'd by the Mock-Council of Galatia [at the end of 375. In-

π *l.* 4. *c.* 7. *p.* 667. *c, d.* ρ *Phiſg. l.* 8. *c.* 3. *p.* 108, 109. *& alii.* σ *c.* 4. *p.* 109, 110. | *n. p.* 325, 328. τ *Blond. prim. p.* 453. υ *Blond. prim. p.* 140.

ſtead

ſtead of Hythius, the Tripartite hiſtory reads Euſtathius, φ and Valeſius Evethus, [which has no more relation to Hypſius than the other. But if Hypſius was Biſhop of Parnaſſus, as there is a good deal of probability, ſince] χ Ecdicius who was put in his place, is ſurnam'd of Parnaſſus [he was not Biſhop till after the year 378, and after S. Baſil,] ↓ who comforts the Church of Parnaſſus upon the death of their Biſhop. For that Biſhop, who it is plain died in poſſeſſion of his Church, [is not Hypſius who was diſpoſſeſs'd for Ecdicius to be put in his place.

Hypſius return'd in all likelihood in Theodoſius's reign; but he was not Biſhop till after 370. He is not without doubt] ω that ancient Biſhop, for whoſe defence S. Amphilochius went to Parnaſſus, whilſt S. Gregory Nazianzen was alive who thank'd him for it, [and therefore before 390. He might go to Parnaſſus for a Biſhop of another city, becauſe calumnies were rais'd againſt him there, or becauſe the Governor was there, or for ſome other reaſon.

It may be thought ſtrange, that a Council of Galatia ſhould depoſe a Biſhop of Parnaſſus,] α who was of Cappadocia in 458: [and I do not know whether this might not make us believe, that Hypſius was Biſhop of Ancyra itſelf where the Council was held, having ſucceeded Athanaſius in the year 373, and that Ecdicius, who was before Biſhop of Parnaſſus, after him upon whoſe death S. Baſil writes, left his Church at that time, to ſeize upon that of Ancyra the metropolis of Galatia. But I think it is ſtill better to believe, that Arians ſupported by the authority of the Lieutenant, and under an Arian Emperor, did not put themſelves to ſo much trouble about forms. There might be even ſome Biſhops of Cappadocia in their Mock-Council. It is after the depoſition of Hypſius] β that Ecdicius is ſurnam'd of Parnaſſus.

φ *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 12. *p.* 222. *b.* χ *Baſ. ep.* 10, 264. *p.* 53. *c.* | 263. *a.* ↓ *ep.* 185. *p.* 198. ω *Naz. ep.* 164. *p.* 875. *d.* α *Geo. ſac. p.* 255. β *Baſ. ep.* 10. *p.* 53. *c.*

NOTE

NOTE XCVII. referr'd to in §. 132. p. 457.

At what time the Goths began to turn Arians.

[IT is already agreed, that Bishop Ulphilas was the instrument of God's anger in seducing the Goths and making them embrace Arianism. But it is not agreed in what manner and at what time this misfortune happen'd.] γ Orosius says, that the Goths having sent to Valens desiring some Bishops to teach them the rule of the Christian faith, he was so wicked as to send them teachers of the Arian impiety; and that afterwards they kept to the first instructions which they had receiv'd when they submitted to the name of Jesus Christ. [But we hope to shew clearly enough when we come to S. Sabas of Gothia, that religion was of a longer standing among them, and that their first preachers were not Arians, but Catholicks and Saints.]

δ Philostorgius will have it, that Ulphilas was ordain'd in Constantine's reign by Eusebius of Nicomedia, ε and afterwards instructed his people in the doctrine he had receiv'd from this Chief of Arianism. [But he is not at all to be believ'd in this point:] ζ And Socrates, who is follow'd by Sozomen, assures us that Ulphilas continued always in the Nicene faith till the year 360 at least.

η Socrates believes, that he turn'd Arian before Athanaric's persecution; and that they who suffer'd at that time, that is about the year 372, were Arians. [But it may be seen in the text, that S. Basil, S. Augustin, Orosius, and all the Church in general is absolutely against him. So that it may be laid down as a fix'd and incontestable point, that the Goths were still Catholicks in 372.]

θ As to the war between Athanaric and Fritigern, describ'd by Socrates and Sozomen, which, according to these authors, introduc'd Arianism into the country of the Goths, [that may have some probability in it, provided it is not said,] ι with Socrates, that the Christians whom Athanaric executed, were some of those whom Ulphilas made to embrace Arianism; [nor] κ that the division between Fritigern and Athanaric did not happen till after they had pass'd the Danube [in 376,] as we read in Sozomen, unless instead of ὑσεροῦν we read πρότερον; [without which he contradicts himself. What is certain, is that the thing is plainly insupportable, according to the account of what happen'd after the passage of the Goths.] λ And Athanaric did not pass the Danube at all at that time. S. Isidore places this war

ι See Valens, § 16.

γ *Oros. l. 7. c. 33. p. 219. 2. d.* δ *Phisg. l. 2. c. 5. p. 12.* ε *p. 13.* ζ *Socr. l. 2. c. 41. p. 155. a.* | *Soz. l. 6. c. 37. p. 697. d.* η *Socr. l. 4. c. 33. p. 251. c.* θ *a, b, c.* | *Soz. p. 697. b, c.* ι *Socr. p. 251. c.* κ *Soz. p. 697. b.* λ *Amm. l. 31. p. 443.*

before

before the Goths had paſt the Danube, but in the 13th year of Valens, and in the æra 415, [that is in the year 377, a year after their going into Thrace. It muſt even be confeſs'd, that this whole civil war among the Goths, and this aſſiſtance given to Fritigern by Valens, may ſeem ſuſpicious enough, ſince neither Ammianus, nor the other authors who liv'd neareſt that time, nor Zoſimus, relate any thing of it.] μ On the contrary, Ammianus makes Fritigern one of the Chiefs of the Thervingi, [and by conſequence ſubject to Athanaric King of the Goths, who bore that name.

It is then certainly better to keep cloſe to Theodorit,] ν who ſays that the Arians engag'd the Goths to embrace their communion and doctrine, when they deſir'd to retire within the dominions of the Empire [in 376,] becauſe the Huns had driven them out of their country. [This opinion which is very probable in itſelf,] ξ is plainly authoriz'd by Sozomen: And it is eaſy to refer to that, what there is that is true in Oroſius's account. [We may ſay likewiſe, that S. Iſidore's chronicon is expreſs for it,] ο ſince it places the fall of the Goths into Arianiſm in the æra 415, and in the 13th year of Valens's reign, [that is in 376 or 377, tho' he was in the wrong to join it to the war between Athanaric and Fritigern, rather than to the going of the Goths into Thrace, which he does not place till the year after.

But at the ſame time we muſt take notice of ſeveral miſtakes which theſe authors mix with the truth. For beſides that of S. Iſidore which we have juſt mention'd, and that of Oroſius who makes Chriſtianity begin at this time among the Goths,] π Sozomen is miſtaken without doubt, when he ſays that Ulphilas join'd the Arians at Conſtantinople. [Not that he might not be ſtopt as he was going to Conſtantinople, but it is certain this matter was tranſacted at Valens's Court, as Theodorit ſays, that is, at Antioch. It is plain likewiſe, that Theodorit is miſtaken on his ſide, in putting the name of Eudoxius into his account who was dead as early as the year 370, and in aſcribing to him what might be done by Euzoïus, or Dorotheus his ſucceſſor, or ſome other Arian Biſhop;] ρ as he is in another place where he ſays, that Valens would oblige S. Baſil to communicate with Eudoxius, [who at that time had been dead above eighteen months. But excepting this miſtake, his account ſeems very probable, and is embarraſs'd with no contradiction, as thoſe of the others, it being probable enough that when Ulphilas had a mind to draw the Goths into Arianiſm, he deſir'd ſome preachers of Valens, who certainly did not refuſe him them, if he did not offer them to him firſt.]

μ *p.* 440 --- 443. ν *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 33. *p.* 704, 705. ξ *Soz. p.* 697. *b, d.* ο *Grot. r. Get. p.* 710. π *Soz. p.* 697. *d.* ρ *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 16. *p.* 682. *b.*

NOTE

NOTE XCVIII. referr'd to in §. 134. p. 465.

That Valens did not in all likelihood recall the Confessors.

σ VAlens's order for recalling the exil'd Catholicks being certified by S. Jerom and Rufinus contemporary authors, [there seems to be no ground for calling it into question.] τ If Gratian publish'd an order of the same nature after Valens's death, as Theodorit, Socrates, and Sozomen assure us, [that might be to explain that of Valens, which being forc'd from him, was not perhaps express enough; or to give it a greater authority, that neither the Arians nor any others might put any obstacle in the way; or because he made mention of their being recall'd in putting them again in possession of their Churches, which Valens had not done. The same historians do not place the return of the Confessors till after Valens's death, and make it the consequence of Gratian's edict, either because they seem to have been ignorant of Valens's having already recall'd them, or because the disturbances in the State had hindred them from laying hold of Valens's indulgence, or for some other reason unknown to us.

But what perplexes us more, is that] υ Theodorit makes S. Isaac say to Valens, when this prince left Constantinople to march against the Goths a month or two before his death: "Cease, says this Saint to him, from persecuting the Church, "and God will make the war to cease which the Goths make "upon you; Restore to the people their holy pastors, and you "will conquer your enemies without any difficulty, &c." [It is not at all to be doubted, that if S. Isaac spoke in this manner, Valens had given no orders for recalling the Bishops, or else that he had revok'd them.] φ Sozomen makes him say pretty near the same thing. [If, I say, the Bishops had the liberty of returning, it is not only very difficult to defend some of S. Isaac's words, which might be wrong related, but we must reject the whole story, which there is no ground for doing. I do not know whether any verbal promise of Valens, join'd to Peter of Alexandria's return, might not occasion the report, which S. Jerom and Rufinus took to be true, that there had been orders for the Bishops to return. What appears to us to be certain, is that the Greek historians knew nothig of Valens's recalling the Catholicks, or rather that they believ'd the story to be false: For they had read it in Rufinus. And it is likewise certain, that we have no proof, that any of the banish'd Bishops return'd before

σ *Hier. chr.* | *Ruf. l.* 2. *c.* 13. *p.* 258. τ *Thdrt. l.* 5. *c.* 2. *p.* 705. *d.* | *Socr. l.* 5. *c.* 2. *p.* 260. *b.* | *Soz. l.* 7. *c.* 1. *p.* 704, 705.
υ *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 31. *p.* 703. *c.* φ *Soz. l.* 6. *c.* 40. *p.* 630. *b.*

Valens's

Valens's death,] χ except Peter of Alexandria, [who muſt have been the laſt that knew of it, and who might poſſibly return without any orders, upon the knowledge he had of the perplexity Valens was in, and of the affection his people had for him.]

NOTE XCIX. referr'd to in §. 134. p. 465.

That Damaſus's epiſtle confirm'd the Conſubſtantiality, not the faith of Moſes.

ψ THE text of Socrates in Chriſtopherſon's edition ſays, that Damaſus's letter in favour of Peter of Alexandria confirm'd the faith of Moſes. [But the word *Moſes* not being to be found either in Sozomen or Nicephorus, who generally ſpeaking only copy from or paraphraſe upon Socrates, or even in the ancient verſion of his text, which is in the Tripartite hiſtory; and all theſe authors ſpeaking of nothing here but the Nicene faith or Conſubſtantiality, it cannot well be doubted but inſtead of τῆ μωϋσέως it ſhould be read τῆ ὁμοουσίᾳ, [as we read it in Valeſius's edition *c.* 37. *p.* 254. *b.* [Beſides, the term confirming the faith of a particular perſon, which can only ſignify approving of it, does not ſeem to be a very proper and very common expreſſion.]

NOTE C. referr'd to in §. 136. p. 474.

That Demophilus liv'd near Conſtantinople after his being excluded the Churches.

ω PHiloſtorgius ſays, that after Theodoſius had taken the Churches of Conſtantinople from the Arians, Demophilus their Biſhop retir'd to Berea. α But it is certain, according to Socrates and Sozomen, that he liv'd till his death, that is till the year 386, near Conſtantinople, and he always carried himſelf as Biſhop of that city among his own ſect, β who notwithſtanding all the authority of the Emperor, were continually making efforts to trouble and diſturb the Orthodox. [If it be ſaid, that Demophilus quitted the parts about Conſtantinople, becauſe of the laws which Theodoſius made in the year 383, and that he return'd thither afterwards, we do not ſee that Socrates and Sozomen are contrary to it.]

χ *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 37. *p.* 254. ψ *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 37. *p.* 254. *c.* ω *Philſg. l.* 9. *c.* 19. *p.* 133. α *Socr. l.* 5. *c.* 7, 12. *p.* 264. *a.* | 271. *c.* | *Soz. l.* 7. *c.* 5, 14. *p.* 709. *c.* | 722. *c, d.* β *Naz. or.* 32. *p.* 511. *c.*

NOTE

NOTE CI. referr'd to in §. 137. p. 476.

The time of Peter of Alexandria's death, and how long he was Biſhop.

γ WHEN S. Ambroſe mentions the death of Athanaric, [which happen'd upon the 25th of January 381,] he ſpeaks of Peter of Alexandria δ in ſuch a manner that it cannot be doubted but he thought him ſtill living. [This obliges us to ſay, that his death was not known in the Weſt till after that of Athanaric, and that therefore he could not die till after that Prince, or at the ſame time with him.] ε It is certain at leaſt by the law of the 28th of February 380, that he was alive then. [Neither can we ſay that he died long after Athanaric, ſince Timothy his ſucceſſor aſſiſted at the Council of Conſtantinople the ſame year 381, ſome time before the 30th of July. So that Sozomen was in the right to ſay,] ζ that he died a little before that Council.

[Socrates on the contrary is certainly miſtaken,] η when he ſays that he died ſhortly after he was reſtor'd, [in the beginning of the year 378,] θ and that Timothy ſucceeded him as early as the beginning of Theodoſius's reign. Nicephorus's chronicon is likewiſe miſtaken with the Oriental one *p.* 117, in allowing him to have been Biſhop but one year after his reſtoration, as well as Eutychius who gives him ſix in all *p.* 491, and the Oriental chronicon *p.* 117, which reckons five years and two hundred eighty eight days; as Theophanes is miſtaken another way *p.* 51. *c*, in making his epiſcopate laſt for ten years.

[If he died in the beginning of the year 381, it was probably upon the 14th of February,] ι upon which day the calendars of the Cophtites mention the feſtival of one Peter a Patriarch. And yet the Oriental chronicon places his death upon Thurſday the 26th of Abib, [which is the 20th of July. But this is certainly ſome miſtake of the tranſcriber: For this day is reckon'd as the 170th of the Egyptian year, which begins upon the 29th of Auguſt, and as the 388th after the 2d of May on which day S. Athanaſius died: Now theſe two numbers are widely diſtant from the 20th of July, but on the contrary they agree with the 14th of February, on which day the Egyptians honour Peter; ſo that we cannot well doubt but this was the day of his death, and that inſtead of *vigeſima ſexta Abibi* in the Oriental chronicon, it ſhould be read *vigeſima Amſchir*. The epocha of

γ *Amb. de Spi. pr. p.* 214. δ *Bar.* 381. §. 13. ε §. 14.
ζ *Soz. l.* 7. *c.* 7. *p.* 711. *c.* η *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 37. *p.* 254. *c.*
θ *l.* 5. *c.* 3. *p.* 261. *a.* ι *Boll.* 2. *may*, *p.* 247. *f.* | 14. *feb.* *p.* 742. *b.*

the

the death of Timothy his ſucceſſor confirms the ſame thing, as we ſhall ſee in Note 102. The 14th of February was Sunday in 381, and not Thurſday. But it concerns the Oriental chronicon to reconcile itſelf, if it ſeems good, to the more ancient and more authentick authors.]

NOTE CII. referr'd to in §. 137. p. 479.

How long Timothy govern'd the Church of Alexandria, and when he died.

[IF] * Timothy of Alexandria died in 385, as Socrates ſays, [he did not govern five whole years, not having begun till 381.] And yet Nicephorus's chronicon and Theophanes allow him eight years, and Eutychius *p.* 491, reckons ſeven. The Oriental chronicon ſays ſix years and a hundred fifty ſix days, which agrees with Theophanes *p.* 60. *c*, who places his death in the ninth year of Theodoſius, [which preceded the death of Maximus, that is in 387. The hundred and fifty ſix days of the Oriental chronicon beginning upon the 14th of February, end upon the 20th of July, that is the 26th of the laſt Egyptian month call'd Abib or Epiphi.] And Theophanes ſays indeed that he died upon the 26th of this month, or the 25th as two manuſcripts have it. The Oriental chronicon ſays Sunday the 20th. [But it ſhould be read the 26th ſince it reckons that day as the 356th of the Egyptian year. So that, according to this chronicon, as well as according to Theophanes, Timothy died upon the 20th of July. As to the year, the Sunday mention'd by the Oriental chronicon is on Socrates's ſide, for it agrees with the 20th of July 385, in which year E was the dominical letter. What determines us ſtill more ſtrongly to follow this opinion, is that Nicephorus, Theophanes, and Eutychius agree in allowing twenty eight years to Theophilus who was Timothy's ſucceſſor; and the Oriental chronicon ſays twenty ſeven years and eighty ſeven days.] λ Now he died, according to this chronicon and Socrates, upon the 15th of October 412. [He muſt then have been Biſhop in the year 385, before the 15th of October, and the eighty ſeven days make up the time exactly from the 20th of July to the 15th of October.]

* *Socr. l.* 5. *c.* 12. *p.* 271. *b, c.*

λ *Socr. l.* 7. *c.* 7. *p.* 343. *d.*

NOTE

NOTE CI. referr'd to in §. 137. p. 476.

The time of Peter of Alexandria's death, and how long he was Biſhop.

γ WHEN S. Ambroſe mentions the death of Athanaric, [which happen'd upon the 25th of January 381,] he ſpeaks of Peter of Alexandria ᵹ in ſuch a manner that it cannot be doubted but he thought him ſtill living. [This obliges us to ſay, that his death was not known in the Weſt till after that of Athanaric, and that therefore he could not die till after that Prince, or at the ſame time with him.] ε It is certain at leaſt by the law of the 28th of February 380, that he was alive then. [Neither can we ſay that he died long after Athanaric, ſince Timothy his ſucceſſor aſſiſted at the Council of Conſtantinople the ſame year 381, ſome time before the 30th of July. So that Sozomen was in the right to ſay,] ζ that he died a little before that Council.

[Socrates on the contrary is certainly miſtaken,] η when he ſays that he died ſhortly after he was reſtor'd, [in the beginning of the year 378,] θ and that Timothy ſucceeded him as early as the beginning of Theodoſius's reign. Nicephorus's chronicon is likewiſe miſtaken with the Oriental one *p.* 117, in allowing him to have been Biſhop but one year after his reſtoration, as well as Eutychius who gives him ſix in all *p.* 491, and the Oriental chronicon *p.* 117, which reckons five years and two hundred eighty eight days; as Theophanes is miſtaken another way *p.* 51. *c*, in making his epiſcopate laſt for ten years.

[If he died in the beginning of the year 381, it was probably upon the 14th of February,] ι upon which day the calendars of the Cophtites mention the feſtival of one Peter a Patriarch. And yet the Oriental chronicon places his death upon Thurſday the 26th of Abib, [which is the 20th of July. But this is certainly ſome miſtake of the tranſcriber: For this day is reckon'd as the 170th of the Egyptian year, which begins upon the 29th of Auguſt, and as the 288th after the 2d of May on which day S. Athanaſius died: Now theſe two numbers are widely diſtant from the 20th of July, but on the contrary they agree with the 14th of February, on which day the Egyptians honour Peter; ſo that we cannot well doubt but this was the day of his death, and that inſtead of *vigeſima ſexta Abibi* in the Oriental chronicon, it ſhould be read *vigeſima Amſchir*. The epocha of

γ *Amb. de Spi. pr. p.* 214.
ᵹ *Soz. l.* 7. *c.* 7. *p.* 711. *c.*
ε *l.* 5. *c.* 3. *p.* 261. *a.*
ζ *p.* 742. *b.*
η *Socr. l.* 4. *c.* 37. *p.* 254. *c.*
θ *Bar.* 381. §. 13.
ι *Boll.* 2. *may*, *p.* 247. *f.* | 14. *feb.*
ι §. 14.

the

the death of Timothy his ſucceſſor confirms the ſame thing, as we ſhall ſee in Note 102. The 14th of February was Sunday in 381, and not Thurſday. But it concerns the Oriental chronicon to reconcile itſelf, if it ſeems good, to the more ancient and more authentick authors.]

NOTE CII. referr'd to in §. 137. p. 479.

How long Timothy govern'd the Church of Alexandria, and when he died.

[IF] * Timothy of Alexandria died in 385, as Socrates ſays, [he did not govern five whole years, not having begun till 381.] And yet Nicephorus's chronicon and Theophanes allow him eight years, and Eutychius *p.* 491, reckons ſeven. The Oriental chronicon ſays ſix years and a hundred fifty ſix days, which agrees with Theophanes *p.* 60. *c*, who places his death in the ninth year of Theodoſius, [which preceded the death of Maximus, that is in 387. The hundred and fifty ſix days of the Oriental chronicon beginning upon the 14th of February, end upon the 20th of July, that is the 26th of the laſt Egyptian month call'd Abib or Epiphi.] And Theophanes ſays indeed that he died upon the 26th of this month, or the 25th as two manuſcripts have it. The Oriental chronicon ſays Sunday the 20th. [But it ſhould be read the 26th ſince it reckons that day as the 356th of the Egyptian year. So that, according to this chronicon, as well as according to Theophanes, Timothy died upon the 20th of July. As to the year, the Sunday mention'd by the Oriental chronicon is on Socrates's ſide, for it agrees with the 20th of July 385, in which year E was the dominical letter. What determines us ſtill more ſtrongly to follow this opinion, is that Nicephorus, Theophanes, and Eutychius agree in allowing twenty eight years to Theophilus who was Timothy's ſucceſſor; and the Oriental chronicon ſays twenty ſeven years and eighty ſeven days.] λ Now he died, according to this chronicon and Socrates, upon the 15th of October 412. [He muſt then have been Biſhop in the year 385, before the 15th of October, and the eighty ſeven days make up the time exactly from the 20th of July to the 15th of October.]

* *Socr. l.* 5. *c.* 12. *p.* 271. *b*, *c.* λ *Socr. l.* 7. *c.* 7. *p.* 343. *d.*

NOTE

NOTE CIII. referr'd to in §. 139. p. 485.

That what S. Amphilochius got Theodosius to do againſt the hereticks, cannot be better plac'd than in the year 383.

μ THE ſtory which Theodorit and Sozomen relate of S. Amphilochius, ν cannot be plac'd either in 380, as Sozomen does, when Theodoſius came the firſt time to Conſtantinople, if Arcadius was already Auguſtus, as Theodorit ſays, and as the ſtory itſelf requires; nor when Theodoſius return'd into the Eaſt after the defeat of Maximus, as Theodorit will have it, that is in the year 391, ξ if Arcadius had been Auguſtus but a little while, as Theodorit himſelf ſays, and if Flaccilla the Empreſs who was dead before the year 386, acted that part in it which Sozomen gives her. ο So that it cannot be better plac'd than in 383, at the beginning of which year Arcadius was made Auguſtus. [And in the middle of the ſame year there was a great Council at Conſtantinople, at which it is eaſy to imagine S. Amphilochius was preſent. There is likewiſe probability enough, that what S. Amphilochius deſir'd of Theodoſius, was order'd by the laws of the 25th of July and the 3d of September the ſame year, which might poſſibly be enacted in conſequence of his ſolicitations.]

NOTE CIV. referr'd to in §. 139. p. 486.

That S. Amphilochius deſir'd, the Hereticks might be forbidden to meet, even out of the towns.

π THeodorit ſays, that S. Amphilochius deſir'd of Theodoſius, that the aſſemblies of the Arians ſhould be baniſh'd out of the towns, and that Theodoſius thinking this deſire too ſevere, refus'd it at firſt. [And yet it is what Theodoſius had already order'd in ſeveral laws two years before:] ρ and Socrates who ſays that he tolerated the aſſemblies of the hereticks, acknowledges however that it was only out of the towns. [There is therefore all the likelihood in the world, that S. Amphilochius deſir'd they ſhould be forbid to meet, even out of the towns.

μ *Thdrt. l.* 5. *c.* 16. *p.* 725.] *Soz. l.* 7. *c.* 6. *p.* 710. ν *Bar.* 383. §. 33. ξ *Thdrt. p.* 725. *b.* ο *n. p.* 46. 1. *c. d.* | *Bar.* 383. §. 32, 33. π *Thdrt. l.* 5. *c.* 16. *p.* 725. *b.* ρ *Socr. l.* 5. *c.* 20. *p.* 280. *b.*

And

And indeed there is a great deal of reaſon to think, that it was upon his requeſt that Theodoſius made the law of the 25th of July 383, which forbids all their aſſemblies, and that of the 3d of September following, which expreſly forbids them to meet any where, even in the country.]

NOTE CV. referr'd to in §. 140. p. 490.

How long the parties of Marinus and Dorotheus continued.

σ THE text of Socrates has it, that the Arians after having been divided among themſelves for thirty five years, reunited under the Conſulate of Theodoſius the younger and Plinthas. [But Plinthas was Conſul in 419 with Monaxis and not with Theodoſius; beſides that the terms of Socrates are not thoſe which are uſually made uſe of for two Conſuls of the ſame year.] τ The Tripartite hiſtory tranſlates it, *When Theodoſius was Emperor and Plinthas Conſul*, which is contrary to his text; and moreover, we cannot make out thirty five years from the election of Marinus in the year 386, under whom the ſchiſm commenc'd, to the Conſulate of Plinthas in 419. Therefore the Tripartite hiſtory reads twenty five inſtead of thirty five; and Valeſius follows it in his tranſlation and notes *p.* 73. 1. *a*, where he ſays the ſchiſm began in the year 394. He mentions it in other places as a thing that is certain, [tho' it is only a concluſion that follows from his corrections: and that is the difficulty we meet with in his opinion.] υ For by the manner in which Socrates deſcribes the original of the ſchiſm among the Arians, it appears that it follow'd pretty ſoon after the inſtalment of Marinus which was perform'd in 386: [and ſo muſt be a long time before 394. Beſides, ſince he has alter'd nothing in Socrates's text, and does not confirm his corrections by the authority of any manuſcript, it is a ſign that thoſe which he had, agree with the printed copies. And indeed] φ the number thirty five is read likewiſe in Sozomen and Nicephorus.

[I do not know then if it would not be better to read the text of Socrates as it is: for it is eaſy to make a good ſenſe out of it by changing only καὶ into μετὰ, which is that the reunion was made the year after the Conſulate of Plinthas, which is the year 420, when Theodoſius the younger was Conſul the ninth time with Conſtantius, and which was the thirty fifth year after the beginning of the ſchiſm, if it began

σ *Socr. l.* 5. *c.* 23. *p.* 292. *a. b.* τ *Trip. l.* 9. *c.* 40. *p.* 138. *c.*
υ *Socr. l.* 5. *c.* 12, 23. *p.* 271. *c.* | 291. *c.* φ *Soz. l.* 7. *c.* 17. *p.* 730. *d.* | *Nphr. l.* 12. *c.* 30. *p.* 286. *b.*

in 386, as may eaſily be believ'd. If it is ask'd, why Socrates deſcrib'd this Conſulate of Theodoſius, not by Conſtantius his collegue, but by Plinthas the Conſul of the year before, it may reaſonably enough be anſwer'd, that it is becauſe] χ this lord had a great hand in the accommodation, as we learn from Sozomen. And it is obſervable, that Sozomen in this place ſays, not that Plinthas was Conſul then, but that he had been, ἀνὴρ ὑπατικός. [So that this is a new reaſon for believing, that the accommodation was not made till after the year 419.]

χ *Soz. p.* 730. *d.*



THE

THE HISTORY OF THE General Council OF NICE.

SECTION I.

The occasion and the calling of the Council.

WHEN Constantine had made himself master of the East by the defeat of Licinius, which happen'd in September 323, he found the Church there disturb'd with disputes, schisms, and heresies. For [1] all the Bishops were divided among themselves upon the affair of Arius, whom S. Alexander of Alexandria had depos'd from the priesthood about the year 319 for opposing the divinity of the Son of

[1] See S. Alexander of Alexandria, §. 6--10.

God, and who was openly supported by Eusebius of Nicomedia. Egypt in particular had been torn in pieces by the schism which Melitius of Lycopolis had form'd there [2] about the year 306, being mad that S. Peter of Alexandria had depos'd him for several crimes which he had been guilty of. We do not mention a great many other sects either not considerable, or not ancient, because they appear'd as members entirely cut off from the Catholick Church. There was at the same time [3] a dispute among the Catholicks themselves concerning the feast of Easter, which they celebrated on different days: this did not break the unity of the church, but however it disfigur'd the beauty of it, and even afforded matter of scandal to infidels.

[2] See S. Peter of Alexandria, §. 8.

[3] See S. Victor, Pope, §. 6.

Constantine, who was very zealous for the Church, and who heartily wish'd to see all those who worship'd the same God and the same Lord, have likewise but one faith, one heart, and one soul, employ'd the great Hosius of Corduba to reconcile these divisions, and especially [4] those concerning Arianism and Easter. But however great the abilities and inclinations of Hosius were, the disease was too obstinate to give way to the remedies which he applied:] † insomuch that Constantine thought himself oblig'd to have recourse [to the supreme authority of] a General Council, and to make head against the devil with a divine army of the holy Bishops of the Church united together. He form'd this design, when he found that the letter which he sent to Alexandria by Hosius upon the subject of Arianism, had not had the desir'd effect. ω The difficulty about the feast of Easter was one of the principal motives, which induc'd him to call this Council; and we shall see in the sequel, that a desire of healing the Melitian schism contributed likewise towards it, α He came to this resolution by the advice of the Bishops. β S. Alexander of Alexandria was very industrious in persuading him to it, γ and Hosius * likewise had a great hand in it.

[4] See S. Alexander of Alexandria, §. 10.

δ Constantine then assembled this celebrated Council,

† Eus. v. Const. l. 3. c. 5, 6 p. 486. a, b. ω c. 5. p. 484. c, d. | Ath. de syn. p. 872. c, d. | ad Af. p. 933. b. α Ruf. l. 1. c. 1. p. 236. β Epi. 68. c. 4. p. 720. a, b. γ Sulp. l. 2. c. 55. p. 162. δ Epi. p. 720. b. Eus. v. Const. l. 3. c. 6. p. 486. b. | Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 540. | Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 18. d. Soz. l. 1. c. 17. p. 429. d. Ruf. l. 1. c. 1. p. 236. b.

* Nicæna synodus autore illo confecta habebatur.

accord-

according to the terms of the historians, ε and even of the Fathers of the Council. ζ And in order to call them together, he wrote every where to the Bishops η letters full of respect, wherein he desir'd them to repair immediately to Nice, θ which Ammianus calls the mother of the cities of Bithynia. ι It was indeed the principal city of that province in the time of Augustus; κ and when the Emperors Valentinian and Valens order [5] that it should enjoy the same honour with Nicomedia, they say that it had long before the title of metropolis which they confirm to it, without any prejudice however to the rights of Nicomedia, λ which always continued to be the metropolis and capital of all Bithynia, particularly in the ecclesiastical constitution, as was determin'd in the Council of Chalcedon. μ Constantine wrote then to the Bishops to repair to Nice, and nam'd the day on which he desir'd them to be there. ν He furnish'd them at the same time with conveniencies for this journey, ξ as well for themselves as their retinue. [There are none of these letters extant at present, but we may judge of their contents by those [6] which he wrote in 314 to assemble the Council of Arles.]

[5] probably in 364.

[6] See the Donatists, c. 20.

ο The Council was assembled under the Consuls [for the year 325] Paulinus and Julian mention'd by Socrates, π and even by the Council of Chalcedon, and Eusebius's chronicon, ρ that is [about] the twentieth year of Constantine's reign, [which began the 25th of July 306. And so according to these two epocha's, the Council was held in 325. This being a thing in which the whole world now agrees, there is no occasion for dwelling any longer upon it, or for confuting the different opinions of some authors.] σ Some [7] observe that the Council sat from the 14th of June to the 25th of August; and this seems to have had its rise from Atticus Bishop of Constantinople [in the year 419. We shall find indeed, that it was sitting at the time of rejoycing for Constantine's entring into his

[7] Note 1.

ε Thdrt. l. 1. c. 8. p. 546. b. ζ Soz. p. 429, 430.
η Eus. v. Conf. p. 486. b. θ Amm. l. 26. p. 310.
ι Dio, l. 51. p. 458. a. κ Conc. t. 4. p. 714. d. λ p. 715. b. μ Soz. p. 429, 430. ν Eus. p. 486. b.
ξ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 540. c. ο Socr. l. 1. c. 13. p. 43 b.
π Bar. 325. §. 1. ρ Eus. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 22. p. 496. a. l. 4. c. 47. p. 550. b. σ Bar. 325. §. 8.

twentieth year, which began the twenty fifth of July.] τ However the 19th of June is mention'd as the first day of the Council, [either because tho' the 14th had been appointed for its meeting, yet it was not open'd till then, or else because that was the day on which Constantine first appear'd at it.]

Section II.

The Bishops repair to Nice: Of Hosius and the other Principals.

Note 2. [ι THE first authors who have mention'd the number of Bishops, have differ'd therein very much, but they have always made them near three hundred.] υ But S. Athanasius in one passage, [and almost all who have come after him,] reckons three hundred and eighteen. φ Some of the most ancient and celebrated Fathers, as S. Hilary and S. Ambrose, have observ'd something mystical in this number, which agrees exactly with the number of Abraham's servants. χ But the number of Priests and Deacons, and the multitude of others who accompany'd the Bishops, was infinite: ↓ which did not however hinder Constantine from supplying them plentifully every day with all that was necessary for their entertainment. ↓ Sozomen observes, that there were several ingenious persons at the dispute, who came on purpose to assist the Bishops with their discourse.

ω S. Epiphanius says, that they had in his time the names of the three hundred and eighteen Bishops who made up the Council. α Socrates assures us indeed, that in the fifth century they were to be read in what he calls the

τ Conc. t. 4. p. 339. d. | Chr. Al. p. 658. υ Ath. ad Afr. p. 932. c. φ Hil. de syn. p. 137. 1. d. | Amb. de fide, l. 1. c. 9. t. 4. p. 126. c. | pr. p. 113. | ap. Chry. t. 6. h. 4. p. 39. c. χ Eus. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 8. p. 487, c, d. ↓ c. 9. p. 488. a. ↓ Soz. l. 1. c. 17. p. 430. b. ω Epi. 69. c. 11. p. 735. b. α Socr. l. 1. c. 13. p. 43. b.

syno-

synodicon of S. Athanasius ; β and S. Jerom quotes the subscriptions of the Council as a piece certainly authentick. [But the synodicon of S. Athanasius is not now extant ; and tho' we have subscriptions enow to the Council, [2] there is none of them that can pass for authentick, or be of any authority : so we shall collect what history informs us concerning the names and circumstances of those who met in this august assembly. 2 Note 3.

S. Sylvester should without doubt have presided there by reason of his quality of Bishop of Rome.] γ But his advanc'd age hindering him from coming thither, he sent his priests to supply his place, δ and to be present in his room, ε with orders to consent to what should pass there. ζ These Priests of Rome were Vitus and Vincentius. η Vitus who is call d likewise Vito, and Victor according to Baronius, [is in all likelihood the same] θ with Vito the Priest, [3] in whose church in the year 341 the Council of Rome was held for S. Athanasius. [Vincentius may be him whom we find by the sequel of the history to have been Bishop of Capua. These ecclesiasticks whom the Popes took out from the body of their Clergy to send either to Councils or to Emperors, are those who have since been call'd legates *à latere*. [3] ἐνθα Βίτων σωῆγε.

Neither Eusebius nor the ancient historians say any thing of S. Sylvester's sending any other legates to the Council of Nice, but the two Priests Vitus and Vincentius.] ι There is none but Gelasius Cyzicenus, who says that Hosius of Corduba had the same post. [His authority, how inconsiderable soever it be, could not but be of weight in this matter, [4] if it was not certain that he corrupts the text of Eusebius by inserting this and some other clauses. However this opinion has been held by a great many authors in the following ages, some of whom have thought that Vitus and Vincentius represented more particularly the person of the Pope, and that Hosius was in the place of the Pope and all the Western Bishops.] 4 Note 4.

κ It is even pretended that he presided in the Council in this quality. [And, whatever reason there might be for it, this precedence is not altogether without founda-

β Hier. in. Lucif. p. 144. c. γ Eus. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 7. p. 487. a. δ Soz. p. 430. a. ε Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 540. d. ζ Soz. p. 430. a. η Gel. Cyz. l. 2. c. 5. p. 68. | Bar. 325. §. 20. θ Ath. ap. 2. p. 739. c. ι Gel. Cyz. p. 68. d, e. κ Bar. 325. §. 20.

tion.] λ For of all the Biſhops that aſſiſted at the Council, Euſebius takes particular notice of none but that Spaniſh Biſhop ſo much fam'd; [by which all the world agrees that he means Hoſius.] μ S. Athanaſius calls him the chief and the guide of all the Councils, [whether it be that he preſided there, or that he was the life and ſoul of it, as S. Auguſtin was of thoſe of Africa. ν His name ſtands firſt in the ſubſcriptions to the Council of Nice, before thoſe of the Pope's legates; [which would be leſs worth our notice, if we had not Socrates's authority for it,] ξ who obſerves the ſame order. [In 347 he preſided in the Council of Sardica,] ο for he ſign'd firſt there, according
ˢ πρωτεύσας. to S. Athanaſius: π and Theodorit ſays likewiſe ˢ that he was chief there. [But the Biſhop of Antioch did not aſſiſt there, and the Biſhop of Alexandria was there as a perſon accus'd:] ρ and Theodorit in the place where he ſays that Hoſius was the firſt at Sardica, ſays only that he had appear'd very much at Nice.

σ We have even ſome authorities for believing, that it was S. Euſtathius of Antioch who preſided in the Council. τ For John of Antioch writing to S. Proclus [about the year 435,] gives him the title of Firſt of the holy Fathers aſſembled at Nice, υ and Facundus the Firſt of that Council. φ It is collected from Theodorit that he had the firſt place on the right hand, and that he made a ſpeech to Conſtantine in the name of all the Biſhops: [which of courſe belongs to the preſident:] It is thought the ſame might be ſhewn from S. Jerom. The chronicon of Nice-
ᵗ κορυφαίου. phorus calls him expreſly the ᵗ chief of the Fathers at Nice. χ S. Anaſtaſius Sinaïta might likewiſe mean the ſame thing:
ᵘ προέδρος. ↓ and the title of ᵘ Preſident is found in a letter attributed to Pope Felix III; [which would be a much more conſiderable authority, if there were not many reaſons to induce us to believe that this piece is not older than the VIIIth Century.

λ Euſ. v. Conſ. l. 3. c. 8. p. 487. a. μ Ath. de fug. p. 703. d. | ſol. p. 837. d. ν Conc. t. 2. p. 50. e. ξ Socr. l. 1. c. 13. p. 43. a. ο Ath. ap. 2. p. 766. c. π Thdrt. l. 2. c. 12. p. 606. d. ρ c, d. σ Blond. prim. p. 1195. τ Fac. l. 8. c. 1. p. 318. a. υ l. 11. c. 1. p. 468. a. φ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 541. c. | Bar. 325. §. 54, 55. χ Euſt. hex. p. 136. ↓ Conc. t. 4. p. 1072. c.

This

This honour ſhould rather belong to S. Alexander Biſhop of Alexandria, who aſſiſted likewiſe at the Council; but he perhaps declin'd it, leſt he ſhould afford matter of complaint to the Arians, who might look upon him as a party concern'd.] ω He had however all the intereſt and authority which were due to his dignity and merit, and according to the terms of the Council, was there maſter of all things, [becauſe he knew very well how to make uſe of his power only according to order and juſtice.] α He brought along with him S. Athanaſius his Deacon, β or as Theodorit ſtiles him, his Arch-deacon. γ He had a very particular regard for that Saint, δ and he receiv'd a great deal of aſſiſtance from him as well with regard to advice, as many other things, ε tho' he was then but young. [But this is not a place for a panegyrick on the great Athanaſius.

We may ſee elſewhere [8] how great the merit was of thoſe whom we have juſt been mentioning, I mean Hoſius, S. Alexander, and S. Euſtathius, as alſo of S. Macarius of Jeruſalem and Cecilian of Carthage.] ζ For S. Macarius aſſiſted at the Council as one who fill'd one of the Apoſtolick thrones. η We know likewiſe that Cecilian was there, not only from the ſubſcriptions of the Council, where we read his name, θ and from Gelaſius Cyzicenus, ι but likewiſe from the ſixth Council of Carthage in the year 419. [So it is not to be wondred at, if S. Athanaſius, who could hardly have learn'd it any where elſe,] κ has put him in the number of thoſe Apoſtolick men, whoſe uncorrupted faith could not be ſuſpected. A Biſhop ſays in the fifth Council, that he was the only one of Africa who came to the Council of Nice.

[8] See their titles.

[Theſe are they who may be ſaid to have been the chiefs and fathers of the Council, Hoſius by his perſonal merit alone, and the others by their perſonal merit together with that of their ſees. I ſhall add the other Biſhops that occurr in the ancient authors, following that order of the provinces which is obſerved in the ſubſcriptions of the Council.]

ω Thdrt. l. 1. c. 8. p. 548. α Ath. ap. 2. p. 725. d. β Thdrt. l. 1. c. 25. p. 576. b. γ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 20. b. δ Ruf. l. 1. c. 5. p. 237. ε Thdrt. p. 576. b. ζ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 15. p. 562. b. | Soz. l. 1. c. 17. p. 430. a. η Conc. t. 2. p. 54. e. θ Gel. Cyz. l. 2. c. 40. p. 202. ι Conc. t. 2. p. 1592. c. κ Ath. or. 1. p. 291. c.

SEC-

Section III.

Of the Bishops of Egypt, and of the Patriarchate of Antioch.

λ AMong the Bishops of Egypt, the most famous are S. Paphnutius, μ Bishop in the higher Thebaïs, ν and S. Potamo ξ of Heraclea [on the Nile, in the province call'd Arcadia.] ο They were both of them confessors; [and their merit will oblige us to make mention of them more than once.] π Socrates observes, that there was one * Arpocratio and one Cyno. ρ The subscriptions speak only of the former, whom they make Bishop of Naucratis [in Ægyptus prima.] σ Among others which are there nam'd, we may take notice of Adamantius of Cynopolis [in Arcadia or in Ægyptus secunda, for there are two places call'd Cynopolis;] Tyrannus of Antinoë [in Thebaïs prima;] Caius of Thmuis [in Augustamnica prima;] Philip of Panæphysus [in the same province;] and Athas of Schedia in Thebaïs according to the subscriptions, or in Ægyptus prima according to the sacred geography. τ These five Bishops are named with Arpocratio among those who asserted the innocence of S. Athanasius at the Council of Tyre [in 335.] υ Arpocratio, Philip, Caius, and Athas are likewise nam'd among those who subscribed the Council of Sardica.

φ The Bishops of Palestine who were remarkable, are the famous Asclepas of Gaza, [1] and Germanus of Neapolis [or Sichem,] who had assisted about the year 314 at the Councils of Ancyra and Neocæsarea. His name, with those of Peter of Aila, Macrinus of Eleutheropolis, Paul of Maximinopolis, and Silvanus of Azotus, χ is found among those of the Council of Palestine who receiv'd S. Athanasius after the Council of Sardica. [As for those of this and other provinces, who favour'd Arius, we shall speak of them by themselves.]

[1] See Vitalis, and S. Philogonius of Antioch.

λ Ruf. l. 1. c. 4. p. 237. μ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 20. a. ν Conc. t. 1. p. 51. a. ξ d. | Epi. 68. c. 7. p. 723. d. ο a. | Ruf. p. 237. π Socr. l. 1. c. 13. p. 43. b. ρ Conc. t. 2. p. 49. e. σ p. 50. a. τ Ath. ap. 2. p. 797. b. υ p. 768. a. φ Conc. t. 2. p. 50. b, c. χ Ath. ap. 2. p. 775. e.

* *or else*, Harpocratio of Cynopolis.

† In Phœnicia we find Hellanicus [of Tripolis,] to whom Arius has done the honour of putting him in the number of his adversaries together with S. Philogonius and S. Macarius: ω Æneas of Ptolemaïs, Magnus of Pelusium, and Anthony or Anatolius of Emisa are likewise nam'd in the Council of Antioch, [held a few years afterwards.]

α In Syria we have the very admirable Euphratio of Bajanæa, as he is call'd by S. Athanasius, when he says that he was afterwards driven from his see by the Arians; β and S. Paul Bishop of Cæsarea upon the Euphrates, who was maim'd in both his hands under Licinius, having his sinews burnt with a hot iron. He was likewise at the Council of Antioch in 341, with Archelaüs of Dolicha, Bassus of Zeugma, Mauritius of Epiphania, Peter of Gindarus, Piperius of Samosata, and Siricius of Cyrus. We may add to these Solomon or Salaminus of Germanicia, Alphius of Apamæa, and Gerontius of Larissa, who had assisted at the Council of Neocæsarea: Solomon had likewise been at that of Ancyra: Alphius assisted afterwards at that of Antioch; as also Nicomachus of Bostra, and Cyrio of Philadelphia, both in Arabia.

γ S. James of Nisibis [2] is famous for Mesopotamia. He had with him, as well at this Council as at that of Antioch, Etherius of Edessa and Antiochus of Rhesinia.

[2] See his title.

δ Theodorus of Tarsus the metropolis of Cilicia, had been, as is said, instructed [in polite learning] at Athens. It is pretended, that he had for his elder brother Auxentius of Mopsuestia, [who was afterwards famous among the Arians. But that does not oblige us to believe, that Theodorus was of the same principles. Nor is it very certain that he was Bishop in those days,] ε tho' his [3] name is read in the subscriptions of the Council. The same may be said of Macedonius of Mopsuestia, [predecessor to Auxentius whom we just before mention'd.] Macedonius was at the Council of Antioch, and he had there as well as at Nice, for his companions, according to the subscriptions, Hesychius of the lesser Alexandria, Moses of Castabala, and Nicetas of Flavias [or Flaviopolis.]

[3] See Note 3.

† Thdrt. l. 1. c. 4. p. 537. c. ω Conc. t. 2. p. 50. d. | 559. e.
α Ath. de fug. p. 702. d. β Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 540, 541.
γ p. 540. δ Suid. α. p. 492. f. ε Conc. t. 2. p. 52. b.

ζ S. Am-

ζ S. Amphion of Epiphania, which is likewise a city of Cilicia, had confess'd the name of Jesus Christ during the former persecutions. He had assisted at the Councils of Ancyra and Neocæsarea about the year 314. η S. Athanasius puts him among the Apostolick men of his time; θ and even according to some manuscripts, gives him the
[4] Note 5. title of confessor; [4] his name is in the Roman martyrology upon the 12th of June. ι S. Athanasius joins with him Lupus a Bishop likewise in Cilicia, [of whom we know
[5] See Vitalis and S. Philogonius. nothing more, if he be not the same with [5] Lupus Bishop of Tarsus, who assisted at the Councils of Ancyra and Neocæsarea about 314, which would make us reject the subscription of Theodorus his successor.]

Section IV.

Of S. Leontius, S. Hypatius, and the others of Asia minor.

κ Leontius metropolitan of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, [who had also before assisted at the Councils of Ancyra and Neocæsarea about the year 314,] came likewise to Nice to condemn Arius; and it was in this journey that he instructed S. Gregory in the faith, who was afterwards Bishop of Nazianzum and father of the Divine of that
[1] ὁ πάνυ. name. This illustrious Father calls him [1] the great Leontius. λ And S. Athanasius puts him among the Apostolick men, of whose faith there could be no suspicion. [For which reason we cannot at all agree to what Philostorgius says,] μ that he favour'd Arius in the Council.

ν Gelasius Cyzicenus calls him the ornament of the Church: ξ Gregory Priest of Cæsarea in Cappadocia makes a particular panegyrick upon him. He says that before he came to Nice, he had endur'd many hardships for the faith, that many martyrs and holy champions had overcome the Devil by his means, and that many of the faithful had

ζ Soz. l. 1. c. 10. p. 414. c, d. η Ath. or. 1. p. 291. c. θ Hil fr. 1. p. 16. 2. ι Ath. p. 291. c. κ Naz. or. 19. p. 294. a, b. λ Ath. or. 1. p. 291, b. μ Phisg. ap. p. 177. ν Gel. Cyz. l. 2. p. 201. ξ Sur. 10. jul. p. 161. §. 12.

arriv'd

arriv'd at the kingdom of heaven under his conduct, particularly the great S. Gregory of Armenia, ο who, according to his life, was ordain'd Bishop by S. Leontius. π And they add moreover, that he oblig'd all his successors with solemn oaths to be ordain'd by the Archbishop of Cæsarea. ρ The same Gregory the Priest says, that in his time the corpse of S. Leontius was to be seen entire even with his hair and nails, and that it sent forth a very fine odour. σ It is observ'd, that he was interr'd in a church of S. Hesychius the martyr. The Roman martyrology commemorates him on the 13th of January. τ It is pretended, without proof, that his corpse was remov'd to Vicentia, and afterwards to Metz.

υ S. Athanasius joins with Leontius Eupsychius Bishop [of Tyanæ] likewise in Cappadocia, and also three celebrated Bishops of Pontus or Armenia, S. Basileus [of Amasea,] S. Meletius [of Sebastopolis,] and Longianus [of Neocæsarea.] φ So that it is ridiculous in Philostorgius to reckon the three last among those who favour'd Arius in the Council of Nice. [But it is even very difficult to prove that S. [2] Basileus assisted at this Council, because according to S. Jerom's chronicon he was dead in the year 320.] χ And the subscriptions of the Council put Eutychianus his successor in his place, tho' they are mistaken in placing him among the Bishops of Armenia magna.

[2] See his title.

ψ As for this province, besides Acrites or Arostanes call'd in the subscriptions Bishop of Diospontum, and who by the modern Greeks is said to have been call'd out of Armenia magna where he had succeeded S. Gregory, to be present at the Council; I say, ω besides this Acrites, we may likewise take notice in the subscriptions of Heraclius of Zelona, who had been at the Councils of Ancyra and Neocæsarea.

α The Greeks pay a great deal of honour to S. Hypatius Bishop of Gangra in Paphlagonia, who they say assisted at the Council of Nice, and wrought many wonders both in his life time and at his death, having the honour of martyrdom. For the Novatians, particularly those of a place

ο Boll. 13. jan. p. 781. §. 4. π §. 7. ρ Sur. 10. jul. p. 161. §. 12. σ Boll. 13. jan. p. 782. §. 12. τ §. 13. υ Ath. p. 291. b. φ Phisg. ap. p. 177. | n. p. 32,33. χ Conc. t. 2. p. 52. d. ψ Bar. 325. §. 27. ω Conc. t. 2. p. 52. d. α Men. 15. nov. p. 248. | 31. mar, p. 274. | Canis. t. 2. p. 746, 909. | Ugh. t. 6, p. 1134.

call'd

call'd Lazica, lying in wait for him in a narrow place among the mountains through which he was to pass, assaulted him with stones and staves, and threw him half dead into a river, where coming a little to himself, he pray'd God to have mercy on them: This did not prevent a wretched woman from giving him a blow with a stone in the temple, which ended his life. She and the other assassins were under the possession of the devil, and afterwards deliver'd at the burial of the saint. [I wish this story had some better attestation than the menologia of the Greeks. What they say of a dragon which S. Hypatius burnt, looks much like a fable, and there are several particulars very hard to be maintain'd. But the history of his death might possibly be collected from better memoirs.] It is plac'd under Constantius. [And so I know not whether that might not serve as a pretence] β for the great severities which Macedonius committed against the Novatians in Paphlagonia and that neighbourhood about the year 357. γ The Greeks have their grand office for S. Hypatius on the 31st of March, δ and they commemorate him likewise on the 14th ε or 15th of November. The Roman martyrology has plac'd him upon the 14th of that same month. ζ Some call him Bishop of Ancyra, confounding him perhaps with another Hypatius who liv'd in the times of the Eiconoclastick Emperors.

[For the see of Ancyra, the metropolis of Galatia, was fill'd at this time by the famous Marcellus,] η who was at the Council of Nice, θ tho' the subscriptions set down Pancratius or Pancarius in his stead. They add four other Bishops of Galatia, Philadelphus of Juliopolis, [who had been at the Council of Ancyra about 314,] Dicasius of Tabia, Erecius of Plata, and Gorgonius of Cynna, [who had subscrib'd that of Neocæsarea.]

ι Theonas of Cyzicus was there likewise for the province of Asia, with Eutychius of Smyrna, and Marinus of Troas. Nuneches Bishop of Laodicea in Phrygia [had appear'd before at the Council of Ancyra.] κ It is pretended,

β Socr. l. 2. c. 38. p. 144. c, d. | Soz. l. 4. c. 21. p. 571, 572. | Juli. ep. 52. p. 212. γ Men. | Canis. p. 746. δ Canis. p. 909. | Ugh. t. 6. p. 1134. a. ε Men. p. 248. | Boll. 31. mar, p. 899. e. ζ Boll. may, t. 1. p. 21, 22. η Ath. ap. 2. p. 742. d. | 750. c. | Thdrt. l. 2. c. 6. p. 588. b. θ Conc. t. 2. p. 52. c. ι c. | Gel. Cyz. l. 2. c. 40. p. 201. κ Bar. 325. §. 36.

that

that S. Nicholas Bishop of Myra in Lycia was at that of Nice, [which we shall examine [s] in another place.] Agapius or Agapetus of Seleucia in Isauria, and Theodorus of Vasagada, are set down in the subscriptions of Nice and Antioch.

[s] See S. Nicholas.

λ Those of Nice mention one Gelasius of Salamis in Cyprus. μ The life of S. Epiphanius, if I may be allow'd to quote it, speaks of Gelasius Bishop of Salamis, who had been taken up in order to be martyr'd. It does not say what happen'd. ν There is one Gerasius among the Bishops of Cyprus who sign'd the Council of Sardica. [But the subscriptions of the Council of Nice make no mention of the great Spiridio Bishop of Tremithus,] ξ who was there nevertheless. ο They mention one Cyril of Paphos. π He is in all likelihood the same with him whom Leontius of Byzantium calls S. Cyriachus Bishop of Paphos and confessor, one of the fathers of the Council of Nice, and an homily of whose he cites upon the Theophany [or the feast of Christmas. This testimony would be more authentick,] ρ if the same Leontius had not put S. Hilary likewise in the number of the fathers of Nice.

Section V.

Of the Prelates of Europe, and of foreign countries, and of all the Fathers of the Council in general.

σ THE subscriptions of the Council mention in the province of Europe, Phædrus Bishop and Metropolitan of Heraclea, and in the margin there is the name of Pedorus. [So this may be Pederotus of Heraclea,] τ whom S. Athanasius puts among the Apostolick men of his time, whose faith was very sincere. υ But his see was afterwards fill'd by Theodorus, φ one of the head leaders

λ Conc. t. 2. p. 54. a. μ Sur. 12. may, p. 581. §. 34. ν Ath. ap. 2. p. 768. c. ξ Ruf. l. 1. c. 5. p. 237. ο Conc. t. 2. p. 54. a. π Leon. in N. & Eu. l. 1. p. 974. c. ρ p. 976. d. σ Conc. t. 2. p. 54. b. τ Ath. or. 1. p. 291. c. υ Blond. prim. p. 1195. φ Ath. p. 290. a.

of

of the Arians, who rais'd him to that dignity, notwithstanding his having been depos'd from the Priesthood.

χ S. Alexander of Byzantium was one of those who voted for the condemnation of Arius at Nice. [We shall speak of him more fully by himself.]

ψ Protogenes the famous Bishop of Sardica in Dacia, and of whom S. Athanasius gives the same encomium as he does of Pederotus, ω was likewise at the Council. α It is observ'd, that Constantine directed a rescript to him in the year 316, to confirm the enfranchisements which had been made in the church in the presence of the people and the Bishops who sign'd there. [He had the honour of receiving at his house in 347 [1] the great Council which restor'd S. Athanasius, and he incurr'd the abuses and anathema's of the Eusebians.]

[1] See S. Athanasius, §. 42.

β S. Athanasius joins with Protogenes Sylvester a Bishop of the same province, [whose name is not read in the subscriptions of the Council.] He names in the same manner Pistus or Postus, and Aristæus Bishops of Greece; Capito of Sicily, and Eustorgius of Italy, [2] who may be the same with him that govern'd the church of Milan about that time.] We find in the subscriptions only Pistus term'd Bishop of Athens. γ There was likewise at the Council another Pistus of Marcianopolis in Mysia.

[2] See the Donatists, §. 13.

δ As for Alexander of Thessalonica who was likewise at the Council, [he must have been a very considerable Bishop,] ε because he calls S. Athanasius his son; ζ and in the Council of Tyre, where he maintain'd the cause of that saint, η Count Dionysius acquaints the Eusebians that it would be matter of great complaint against them, if it should appear that their lord Alexander does not approve of what they do. θ The Greeks on the 15th of May commemorate S. Achilles Bishop of Lariſſa, who they say was renowned for his piety and miracles, had a great share in the victory which the Church gained over Arianism in the Council of Nice, and signaliz'd himself there to the admiration of the whole world. [If this be true, it is surpriz-

χ Soz. l. 2. c. 29. p. 489. a, b. ψ Ath. p. 291. b. ω Gel. C. p. 202. α Bar. 316. §. 73. β Ath. p. 291. b. γ Gel. Cyz. p. 202. δ p. 201. ε Ath. ap. 2. p. 785. c. ζ p. 798. η p. 799. b. θ Boll. 15. may, p. 465.

ing

ing that S. Athanasius did not name him among the Apostolick men of his time.]

ι The subscriptions of the Council mention only one Bishop of Gaul, namely Nicasius, whom they make Bishop of [3] Dijon, [which never was an episcopal see.] κ This obliges us to alter the name into that of [4] Digne, which still continues to be an episcopal city in Provence; λ or into that of Die in Dauphiné; the latter of which churches reckons among its Bishops one Nicasius, whose corpse was honour'd in that cathedral at the end of the eleventh century, and she believes it to be him who assisted at the Council of Nice in the name of all the Gauls. They take all this from an instrument made about the year 1075 by Hugo one of his successors. They observe, that his piety is likewise confirm'd by the life of S. Marcellus of Die, [ς which seems to be a very ancient piece;] and they quote from thence, that this Bishop brought into Gaul the determination of the Council. [This tradition may be the more easily receiv'd,] μ for that the most learned of the church of Digne do not reckon any Nicasius among their Bishops, and believe that they receiv'd the faith from S. Domninus a disciple of S. Marcellinus of Embrun, [who appears not to have liv'd till after the middle of the fourth century.] ν The name of Nicasius is also found among the Bishops of Gaul, who sign'd the Council of Sardica in 347. ξ This is likewise said of Palladius successor to Nicasius, [but I find nothing of him there.]

[3] Diviensis.
[4] Dinienſis.
ς See S. Mamertus, §. 3.

ο What rendred the Council of Nice still more august, was that besides the Bishops from all the provinces of the Roman Empire, there were some likewise from other countries. π For we find there a Bishop of Persia, ρ called John in Gelasius Cyzicenus and in the subscriptions. σ Scythia likewise was willing to have a part in that august assembly: τ Theophilus Bishop of the Scythians or of the Goths having sign'd the Creed, and carried the faith from thence into his own country, where it remain'd uncorrupt to the end of Constantius's reign, [or even to that

ι Conc. t. 2. p. 54. d. κ Gassend. de Din. p. 49. λ Gall. chr. t. 2. p. 554. μ p. 557, 558. 2. ν Ath. ap. 2. p. 767. d. ξ Gall. chr. t. 2. p. 554. 2. c. ο Euſ. v. Conſ. l. 3. c. 7. p. 486, 487. π p. 487. a. ρ Cel. C. p. 201. | Conc. p. 52. b. σ Euſ. v. Conſ. p. 487. a. τ Socr. l. 2. c. 41. p. 155. a.

of Valens.] υ The subscriptions mention this Theophilus under the title of metropolitan of the Goths, with a Bishop of Bosphorus nam'd Domnus or Cathirius, φ and five of Armenia magna; [which they perhaps confound with the less,] to which they attribute but two.

[These are all the names which we have been able to find of those famous men who compos'd this assembly,] χ and made it as it were a representation of that of the Apostles, and a crown of peace which Constantine offer'd to God as an act of thanksgiving for the many victories he had bestow'd upon him. ψ Of these holy Prelates some were eminent for the wisdom of their discourse, others for the severity of their lives and patience under afflictions, and some again for their prudent moderation. ω There were many of them who were adorn'd with Apostolick graces, and many who, as the Apostle says, bore in their bodies marks of the sufferings of Jesus Christ. α Some of them were maim'd in both their hands for Jesus Christ, as we observ'd of S. Paul of Neocæsarea; others, as S. Paphnutius, whose hams were burnt; others who had had their right eye pull'd out, β as this same Saint. γ In a word, there was a great number of confessors, δ and a whole multitude of martyrs. ε There was to be seen assembled in one Church, all that the Churches of Europe, Africa, and Asia could boast of as most considerable, ζ and all the shining lights of the world.

Section VI.

Of the Arian Bishops who were at the Council.

η BUT among this great number of Saints there were some Prelates whose faith was corrupt, tho' they conceal'd their wickedness as much as they could, not having

υ Conc. t. 2. p. 54. d. φ p. 52. d. χ Eus. p. 487. b. ψ c. 9. p. 487. d. | Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 19, 20. ω Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 540. d. α p. 541. a. β Rus. l. 1. c. 4. p. 237. γ c. 2. p. 236. δ Thdrt. p. 541. a. | Chry. t. 5. or. 52. p. 612. ε Eus. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 7. p. 486. d. ζ Mar. V. l. 1. p. 198. b. η Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 541. b.

courage

courage enough to maintain openly the blasphemies of Arius. θ Of this number were those chiefly who were well skill'd in sophistry, and who trusting to their subtilty therein, were displeas'd with the simplicity of the faith. ι Theodorit puts in this rank ι all those whom Arius reckon'd on his side in a letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, *viz.* Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine, Theodotus of Laodicea [in Syria,] Paulinus of Tyre, Athanasius of Anazarbus, Gregory of Berytus, and Actius of Lydda. κ He adds to them Menophantus of Ephesus, Narcissus of Neronias in Cilicia, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Theogonius [or Theognis] of Nice, Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais in Libya.

ι See the Arians, §. 6.

[No body doubts but that to these Eusebius of Nicomedia should be added. Nor can there be any difficulty concerning Maris of Chalcedon,] λ who is reckon'd among the abettors of Arius by Gelasius, Socrates, and Sozomen. μ The subscriptions of the Council shew likewise that he was there. [He was certainly an Arian and a Bishop before the Council,] ν for according to S. Athanasius, he had wrote at that time many blasphemies against Jesus Christ. ξ Philostorgius puts him among the pretended disciples of S. Lucian, as we have observ'd [2] elsewhere. ο He was in 335 one of the famous deputies of Mareotis against S. Athanasius, [and he always signaliz'd himself in the defence of heresy till Valens's reign,] π tho' God had punish'd the blindness of his heart [3] by that of his body.

[2] Ibid.

[3] See the persecution under Julian, §. 5.

[We must take notice in our way,] ρ that Narcissus of Neronias was guilty of many other crimes besides that of Arianism, and that he was depos'd by three several Councils, [which we know nothing of, except that of Sardica in 347.] σ Marcellus of Ancyra charg'd him with having wrote in these very terms, That there was a first and a second God. τ He quotes from one of Narcissus's own letters, that Bishop Hosius [of Corduba] asking him if he admitted [in God] two [4] substances, as Eusebius of Cæsarea did, he an-

[4] ὐσίας.

θ Ruf. l. 1. c. 2. p. 236. ι Thdrt. p. 542. b. | c. 4. p. 538. a. κ c. 6. p. 542. b. λ Gel. C. l. 2. c. 7. p. 85. Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 20. b. | Soz. l. 1. c. 21. p. 435. c. μ Conc. t. 2. p. 54. a. ν Ath. de syn. p. 886. b. ξ Phisg. l. 2. c. 15. p. 20, 21. ο Ath. ap. 2. p. 733, 746. π Socr. | Soz. ρ Ath. de fug. p. 718. d. Eus. in Marc. l. 1. c. 4. a. σ p. 25. c, d.

ſwer'd, I know from his writings that he believes there are three.

[All that are mention'd by Theodorit, make up but thirteen Biſhops for Arius;] υ and Rufinus aſſures us there were ſeventeen.

φ Philoſtorgius adds four Biſhops of Libya, beſides Secundus and Theonas, namely Sentianus of Boræum, Dacus of Berenice, Secundus of Teuchira, and Zopyrus of Barca, χ the three laſt of which we meet with in the ſubſcriptions to the Council, tho' with ſome difference. [And it is not altogether incredible, that Arius had in truth ſix Biſhops for him in Libya,] ψ ſince he boaſts that he was follow'd by all that province. ω Philoſtorgius adds Militius of Thebaïs, [that is the ſchiſmatick, who might probably be at Nice and favour Arius: But there is no likelihood that he was admitted to give a vote, becauſe, as we ſhall find, his affair was not ended till after that of Arius, and he was not receiv'd into the Church but upon condition that he ſhould not perform any epiſcopal office.]

α Philoſtorgius mentions afterwards Patrophilus, Euſebius of Cæſarea, Paulinus, Narciſſus, Athanaſius of Anazarbus, Maris, Theognis, and Euſebius of Nicomedia, [concerning all whom no difficulty ariſes, unleſs it be that Paulinus was dead before according to ſome, tho' in all probability he liv'd till 331. But we know not who Amphion of Singedunum in Phœnicia was. We know not of any city call'd Singedunum but in Mœſia; and we dare not ſay it ought to be Sidon,] β becauſe there is one Theodorus of Sidon in the ſubſcriptions to the Council. γ Philoſtorgius reckons likewiſe among the abettors of Arius, Tarcondimatus of Ægæ in Cilicia, [who is in the ſubſcriptions,] and Eulalius of Cappadocia, [whom we know nothing of,] if it be not the Biſhop of Sebaſtia in Armenia, δ who is alſo call'd Eulogius. ε He joins to them S. Leontius of Cappadocia, S. Baſileus of Amaſea, and S. Meletius of Sebaſtopolis; [which we have ſhewn to be an apparent calumny.]

ζ Gelaſius puts likewiſe Theodorus of Heraclea among the Prelates who favour'd Arius in the Council. [But we

υ Ruf. l. 1. c. 5. p. 237. φ Phiſg. ap. p. 177. χ n. p. 25, 26. ψ Gel. Cyz. l. 1. c. 1. p. 209. ω Phiſg. ap. p. 177. α ibid. β Conc. p. 51. d. γ Phiſg. p. 177. δ Conc. p. 52. d. ε Phiſg. p. 177. ζ Gel. C. l. 2. c. 7. p. 85.

have

have obſerv'd already, that Pederotus a very orthodox man was probably in poſſeſſion of that ſee at that time :] ν And as Theodorus was made Biſhop by the Euſebians, after he had been depos'd from the Prieſthood, [there is no likelihood that he had that character ſo ſoon.] θ Baronius puts likewiſe among the Arians Paul of Laranda, ι whoſe name is among the Biſhops of Iſauria. [He offers no proof of his being an Arian. Theſe are all we find of theſe patrons of falſhood, who were aſſembled with the defenders of truth, and who cannot be ſhew'd to exceed twenty two, the ſame number as Philoſtorgius puts down, but they are not exactly the ſame.

As for what relates to the order which the Biſhops obſerv'd among themſelves at the Council, it is very likely that the unaffected civility and good manners, which S. Paul recommends no leſs to Biſhops than to the other Faithful, took place as much as any other conſideration: At leaſt it would be difficult to find out any more about it.] Baronius gueſſes at it according to his own fancy without any great foundation; κ and Bellarmin diſpoſes them after another manner not more certain, tho' it ſeems to be agreeable to the judgment of Bollandus, who reports the conjecture of that Cardinal, but barely mentions that of Baronius. [It would be much more advantagious to us to know in what method they examin'd and determin'd matters. But God having depriv'd us of that light, we ſhall be oblig'd to place them in that order, for which we ſhall have the beſt authority, or which ſhall appear to us to be the moſt natural.]

Section VII.

The beginning of the Council: Conſtantine comes to it.

[THE Council might be appointed to meet the 14th of June,] λ according to what is cited from Atti-

ν Ath. or. 1. p. 290. a. θ Bar. 325. §. 40. ι Conc. p. 53. c.
κ Boll. 26. feb. p. 637. §. 11. λ Bar. 325. §. 8.

[1] See Note 1.

cus of Constantinople. [1 But there is some probability that it did not begin till the 19th, which is particularly mention'd as the first day of the Council in some ancient records. They spent the first days in preparing and debating matters, that they might come to a formal decision of them in the presence of Constantine, who does not appear to have been there till after the 3d of July.] μ Before then the day appointed for the determination came, at which time Constantine desir'd to be present, the Bishops had many meetings ν in the church of the city, as Valesius thinks may be collected from Eusebius, ξ and employ'd several days in debating matters of faith, ο being afraid to determine so weighty an affair without very mature deliberation.

π They oblig'd Arius to come frequently to their meetings, to inform them certainly of his opinions: (ρ For Constantine had commanded that he should be present at the Council;) σ and that miscreant following the suggestions of the devil who possess'd him, was not afraid to utter the most abominable blasphemies against our Saviour, our hope, and our life, in contradiction to the holy Scriptures and our faith; and did not blush at owning his belief to be agreeable to his monstrous expressions. τ He maintain'd that the Son of God sprang out of nothing; that he did not always exist; that by reason of his free will he was capable of vertue or vice; that he was a creature and a work of God.

υ All the Bishops stopt their ears when they heard him uttering these blasphemies, and many more which S. Athanasius reports; φ and they all concluded unanimously to anathematize such detestable opinions, χ not being able so much as to hear these impious thoughts and expressions. ψ However this did not hinder them from carefully examining his doctrine, ω and some Bishops defended him with a great deal of warmth. These Prelates, enemies to the simplicity of the faith, and trusting to their false di-

μ Soz. l. 1. c. 17, 19 p. 431. a. | 433. b. ν Euf. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 7. p. 486. d. | n. p. 222. 2. b. ξ Ruf. l. 1. c. 2. p. 236. ο c. 5. p. 237. π p. 237. | Soz. p. 431. a. | p. 433. b. ρ Ruf. l. 1. c. 1. p. 236. σ Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 30. c, d. τ Socr. p. 27, 28. υ Ath. or. 1. p. 295. d. φ d. | Socr. p. 27. d. χ Socr. p. 28. a. ψ Soz. l. 1. c. 19. p. 433. b. ω Ruf. l. 1. c. 2. p. 236.

stin-

stinctions, α would not allow people to be satisfied with following the opinion of the ancients, without first examining it. β But they were oppos'd by all the Confessors who were very numerous, γ and all who were against any innovation contrary to tradition.

δ There were several Heathen Philosophers who intermeddled in the disputes which arose, some out of curiosity to learn what our doctrine was, others out of hatred to our religion, to stir the coals of division and schism. This seems to have been before the solemn session of the Council. [But we reserve what is said of these philosophers for another place.]

ε Constantine being inform'd of the arrival of the Prelates at Nice, hasten'd thither, ζ after having celebrated a festival [at Nicomedia] for the victory he had gain'd over Licinius two years before [upon the third day of July,] η for which rejoycings were made on the same day every year. θ He came as much to see the great number of Prelates, as to be a mediator of peace, ι to establish concord, and put an end to all the disputes which the folly of Arius had occasion'd. κ He arriv'd the day before the solemn meeting at which he was resolv'd to be present.

λ Upon the same day, several Bishops came to make their complaints, and to present petitions to him against their brethren, [as we shall give an account in the sequel.] μ It is thought, that this was a piece of artifice of the Arians, who desir'd nothing more than to embroil affairs, and would have been well pleas'd to have rendred the most holy Prelates snspected: [which is agreeable to what Theodorit says,] ν that there were [2] some wretches who endeavour'd to perplex matters and raise disturbances.

[2] φιλαπεχθήμονες ἄνδρες.

ξ On the morrow which was the day appointed for the determination of all the questions, ο as Constantine was willing to be present at the Bishops debates, π they came all to the palace. ρ There was made ready for their recep-

α Soz. l. 1. c. 17. p. 431. a, b. β Ruf. p. 236. γ Soz. p. 431. a. δ Soz. l. 1. c. 18. p. 431. c. ε Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 540. c. ζ Gel. Cyz. l. 2. c. 6. p. 70. | Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 20. a. η Buch. cycl. p. 283. θ Thdrt. p. 540. c. ι c. 19. p. 566. d. κ Gel. Cyz. l. 2. c. 6. p. 70. a. λ Socr. p. 21. a. μ Bar. 325. §. 42. ν Thdrt. l. 1. c. 10. p. 552. b. ξ Euf. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 10. p. 488. a. | Socr. p. 21. a. ο Soz. l. 1. c. 19. p. 433. c. π c. | Euf: p. 488. b. | Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 541. b. ρ Euf. p. 488. a, b.

tion the largeſt hall in the middle of the palace, and ſeats were plac'd on each ſide σ according to the number of the Biſhops. τ When they were come in, and had taken every one his place, they waited with modeſty and ſilence worthy ſo holy an aſſembly, expecting the Prince's coming. At length the Courtiers entred one after another; and afterwards the Emperor, attended not with his ordinary guards, but only with ſuch of his miniſters as were Chriſtians.

υ All the Biſhops roſe from their ſeats as ſoon as they underſtood that the Emperor was coming, and then he entred cloath'd in his purple, embroider'd all over with gold and adorn'd with diamonds. But his ſoul ſeem'd more richly adorn'd with religious devotion and the fear of God, which were conſpicuous in his down-caſt looks, his bluſhing cheeks, his modeſt gate, and his diveſting himſelf of imperial majeſty. φ Being entred, he paſſed through the midſt of the Prelates χ to the upper end of the aſſembly, where he continued ſtanding ↓ till he had aſk'd leave, and the Biſhops had deſir'd him to ſit down. ω He ſat upon a little ſtool of gold, α which was ſet for him in the middle. β The whole aſſembly ſat down after him γ by his order.

δ At which time, ſays Euſebius, the Biſhop who ſat uppermoſt on the right hand, roſe up, and made an elaborate ſpeech, addreſs'd to the Emperor, wherein he return'd thanks to God for the ſucceſſes which he had given to this
3 Note 6. prince. [3 This paſſage has occaſion'd many diſputes to find out who this Biſhop was, who by this very action and the place he had, ſeems to have been the Preſident of the Council. No body however ſays it was Hoſius: But ſome underſtand it of Euſebius himſelf, others of S. Euſtathius of Antioch, or of S. Alexander of Alexandria. If it be neceſſary for us to give judgment in favour of one, the right of S. Euſtathius ſeems better ſupported than that of any other.]

ε When this Biſhop, whoever he was, had ended his ſpeech, and was ſat down again, they all continued ſilent, fixing their eyes upon the Emperor. This prince, after he had caſt his eyes round upon the Biſhops with a chearful
ε Note 7. and kind regard, and had recollected himſelf a little, ſpoke

σ Thdrt. p. 540. b. τ Euſ. p. 488. b. υ b, c. φ c. | n. p. 222. 2. d. | Soz. p. 433. c. χ Euſ. p. 488. d. ↓ Thdrt. p. 541. c. ω c. | Euſ. p. 488. d. α Thdrt. 4. 540. c. β c. | Euſ. p. 488. d. γ Soz. p. 433. c. δ Euſ. v. Conſ. l. 3. c. 11. p. 489. a. ε a.

to

to them with a soft and gentle tone of voice, ζ without rising from his seat. η He made his speech in Latin, tho' he understood Greek. It was afterwards interpreted in Greek by another, and given to the principal Bishops of the Council. θ It contain'd nothing, according to the account of Eusebius, but testimonies of his joy to see in that assembly marks of concern for the division in the Church, and an exhortation to peace and unity.

ι He added, according to Theodorit, that the enemies of the Church being now vanquish'd, and there being not a person who dar'd to oppose the Christians, it was a very melancholy thing to see them fighting against each other, and making themselves the jest of their adversaries, who were over-joy'd to see them ruin themselves: That these quarrels were still more shameful in matters of religion, concerning which they had the instruction of the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures. "For the books of the Evange-"lists and Apostles, said he to them, and the oracles of "the ancient prophets, shew plainly what we ought to be-"lieve concerning the Godhead. For which reason we "ought to banish all controversies, and collect from the "testimonies of those books which are inspir'd by God, "the exposition of these controverted points." [There is no great probability of these words being in the first of Constantine's speeches, because we do not see for what reason Eusebius would omit them. Constantine may have spoken them in the course of the disputes which arose,] κ and in which, according to Eusebius, he speaks several times.

[It was thus that Constantine, acting as a good son with regard to the Bishops, whom he look'd upon as his Fathers, brought them unanimously to agree in the apostolick faith.] λ He allow'd them afterwards carefully and freely to discourse of the questions of faith, μ not designing to appear in the Council, but as one of the Faithful, ν leaving to the Prelates the sole privilege of determining, without prepossessing their judgments by any preceding law. ξ For as to the petitions which had been presented to him the night before against several Bishops, he did not speak of them otherwise than to exhort the Prelates to continue in unity, and mutually to forgive all misunderstandings which might have happen'd.

ζ Socr. p. 21. a. η Eus. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 13. p. 490. b, c.
θ c. 12. p. 489, 490. ι Thdrt. p. 541, 542. κ Eus. p. 490. c.
λ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 21. b. μ c. 9. p. 30. c. ν Amb. ep. 13. t. 5. p. 204. m. ξ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 21. a.

SECT.

Section VIII.

Of the disputes of S. Athanasius and others against Arius: Proofs of the bad principles of the Eusebians.

ο THEY began then to examine the matters which had disturb'd the peace of the Church. π That of Arius, [which was the principal,] was first discuss'd, [with the greater ease,] ρ it having been done before with a great deal of care, σ which did not however prevent several disputes, τ in which many, as well Bishops as Ecclesiasticks who accompany'd them, made themselves known to and esteem'd by the Emperor and his court for the judgment and learning which they shew'd. [So that it is probable these disputes continued some time, and the questions were not determin'd the first day which was appointed for that purpose.

We know not whether all the sessions which were held after Constantine's coming to Nice, for the space of near two months, all which time the Council continued afterwards, according to Atticus, were held in the palace in the presence of Constantine: for authors have not clear'd up that point to us. It is most certain from the words of the Fathers,] υ and from those of Constantine himself, that he was an ear-witness of the blasphemies of Arius, φ and that his impiety was examin'd in his presence. χ He was a witness of the Bishops disputes. He heard them on both hands with a great deal of temper, being patient and attentive to every thing that was said to him; he inclin'd sometimes to one side, and sometimes to the other, to reconcile by degrees those who appear'd most warm in the dispute. He made himself agreeable and aimable to every body, by the air and courtesy with which he spoke to them. He prevail'd with some by his reasons, others he made blush by the force of his expressions; he prais'd those who

ο Soz. l. 1. c. 20. p. 434. b. π Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 27. d.
ρ Soz. l. 1. c. 17, 19. p. 431. a. 433. b. σ c. 20. p. 434. c.
τ c. 17. p. 431. b. υ Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 30. d. φ p. 27. d. χ Euf. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 13. p. 490. b, c.

had

had ſpoken well, and perſuaded all to peace. In ſhort, he did not ceaſe till he had brought them to agree in the ſame faith, and in the ſame ſentiments, touching all the points which were in debate. This is what Euſebius of Cæſarea tells us of the behaviour of Conſtantine in the Council. [But it is to be fear'd he has not told nothing but the truth, becauſe after the manner in which he repreſents him, in this and other places, it looks as if he was maſter of the Council, and had broke in upon its privileges,] ↓ as the Audæan hereticks ſay of him concerning the deciſion about Eaſter. ω But S. Ambroſe aſſures us, that he gave the Biſhops entire liberty to determine as they pleas'd. α They were not under any neceſſity, ſays S. Athanaſius, to condemn Arius, but every one embrac'd the truth voluntarily and freely. [But if the authority of Conſtantine had any force there, it was only, as we ſhall hereafter obſerve, to ſcreen the Euſebians from the puniſhment they deſerv'd.

S. Athanaſius ſignaliz'd himſelf upon this occaſion. He appear'd as the principal perſon in the Council,] β having one of the uppermoſt ſeats, tho' he was no Biſhop, merit as well as dignities giving at that time a degree of honour. γ He diſcover'd with wonderful ſagacity all the cheats and artifices of the hereticks: δ he couragiouſly oppos'd Euſebius, Theognis, and Maris, who ſided with Arius: ε He entred the liſts for the ſupport of the apoſtolick doctrines, and ſhew'd beyond his age an ardent zeal for the faith; which gain'd him the praiſes and bleſſings of all who defended the truth. ζ So that he did all that was in his power in this aſſembly, where the Holy Ghoſt had brought together the choice of all the Church, to ſuppreſs Arianiſm entirely.

η But if the courage wherewith he attack'd the impiety of Arius, was a great proof of his piety, it was at the ſame time one of the principal cauſes of that hatred which the Arians bore to him ever after. θ For thoſe enemies to the divinity of the Son of God, having found by experience with what reſolution he had undertaken the defence

↓ Epi. 70. c. 9. p. 821. a, b. ω Amb. ep. 13. t. 5. p. 204. m. α Ath. or. 1. p. 296. a. β Naz. or. 21. p. 381. a, b. γ Ruf. l. 1. c. 14. p. 244. δ Socr. l. 1, c. 8. p. 20. b. ε Thdrt. l. 1. c. 25. p. 576. b. ζ Naz. p. 381. a. η Ath. ap. 2. p. 725. d. θ Thdrt p. 576. b, c.

of

of it, [look'd upon him as their profeſs'd enemy,] eſpecially when he came to be advanc'd to the Chair of Alexandria, eſteeming the increaſe of his authority the ruin of their power. We have among the works of this Saint a diſpute between him and Arius: but that does not relate to the Council of Nice, [and it is moreover plainly ſuppoſititious.]

ι Marcellus Biſhop of Ancyra was likewiſe a ſtrenuous oppoſer of the Arian hereſy: κ which made the Prieſts of Rome who were at the Council, ſpeak of him to the Pope as a very orthodox man.

λ In the mean time Euſebius of Nicomedia, who had undertaken to protect Arius, ſeeing his errors defeated every way, ſhew'd a ſcandalous concern for his ſafety. He ſent ſeveral perſons to ſolicit Conſtantine in his favour, and to ask protection for him, being afraid not only of ſeeing Arius condemn'd, but alſo himſelf depos'd.

[He deſerv'd it, both as a defender of Arius, and as a follower of his hereſy.] μ For whilſt they were debating what determination they ſhould come to touching the faith, * a letter of Euſebius's, ſays S. Athanaſius, was produc'd, which was a plain proof of his blaſphemies. [It was very likely the ſame letter which S. Ambroſe ſpeaks of,] ν in which Euſebius of Nicomedia ſays, that if Jeſus Chriſt was acknowledg'd to be truly the Son of God, and uncreated, it would be beginning to acknowledge that he was conſubſtantial with the Father. This letter being read in full Council, ξ confounded him who wrote it, and gave no leſs concern to the Saints who heard it, and ſaw the deſtruction of thoſe wretches, for it diſcover'd all the party. The horror they had of it, made them tear it publickly; [but for fear the indignation of the Fathers ſhould proceed farther,] ſome perſons deſignedly quieted the noiſe under the ſpecious pretence of peace, and impos'd ſilence upon all thoſe who us'd ſo admirably to defend the truth.

[The hereſy of the Euſebians appear'd not only by this letter,] ο but likewiſe by the ſpeeches which were made

ι Ath. ap. 2. p. 742. d. | 750. c. κ p. 750. c. λ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 19. p. 567. a. μ c. 7. p. 542. a. ν Amb. fid. l. 3. c. 7. 159. g. ξ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 7. p. 543. b. ο Ath. dec. Nic. p. 251. a.

* Valeſius and the Benedictins (*Thdrt. n. p.* 10. 1. *b. c.* | *Ath. vit. B. p.* 9. 1. *f.*) will have this to be the confeſſion of faith reported by Euſebius of Cæſarea, which is ſpoken of a little after.

in

in the Council, where they declar'd themſelves againſt God in very impious expreſſions. The Fathers with a great deal of civility and candor deſir'd them to defend their principles, if they had any good reaſons to produce for them. But they no ſooner open'd their mouth, but they contradicted themſelves, and every body condemn'd them; inſomuch that finding themſelves not able to defend their hereſy, they held their peace, and ſhew'd by their ſilence the confuſion they were in for being engag'd in ſo bad a cauſe.

SECTION IX.

The Euſebians offer a Creed, which is rejected: The Conſubſtantiality and the Nicene Creed are ſettled.

π IT was moreover upon this occaſion, that the deſire of oppoſing the apoſtolick doctrines in defence of Arius, put the Euſebians upon drawing up a confeſſion of their faith, and preſenting it to the Council. ρ Euſebius of Cæſarea gives it us at large in a letter which he wrote to his Church concerning it: and he adds, that it was look'd upon as a good one, σ that it ended all diſputes, that Conſtantine firſt of all declar'd that it was a very excellent one, that it was his belief, and that every body ought to ſubſcribe it only with the addition of the term Conſubſtantial: and under the pretence of adding that word, ſays he, another Creed was made.

[But it is dangerous truſting to Euſebius's report, and it is hard to believe that the Council ſhould be ſatisfied with a confeſſion of faith, wherein the Euſebians, inſtead of acknowledging their errors and renouncing them,] τ maintain'd expreſly that they had always continued in the true doctrine. [This confeſſion condemn'd at moſt only the groſſer blaſphemies of Arius, without touching upon

π Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 542. b. ρ c. 11. p. 553. b. σ p. 554. b. τ p. 553. c.

the

the others.] υ And if it did even say expressly, that Jesus
[1] γεγενεμένον. Christ [1] was made before all ages, as we read it there to this day, [the Council took care not to allow that term to be made use of to express the eternal generation of the Son of God.]

φ And indeed Theodorit, [without regarding the praise which Eusebius gives himself,] assures us that as soon as it was read, it was torn in pieces, every body esteeming it an erroneous and sophisticated belief, and accusing the authors of it as traitors to truth. [I think we should refer to this what S. Athanasius says,] χ that the Council absolutely rejected the terms which the Eusebians had invented.

[It may be some would be willing to clear the confession of faith which Eusebius of Cæsarea boasts so much of, from the shame of being rejected and torn by the Council. But in order to that, it must be pretended that he presented one for himself only, or that the Eusebians presented two different ones. No body gives us any account of either of these things, and the first has no probability in it.]

ϟ Eusebius is no less insincere, when thro' a studied piece of malice, he would make us believe that Constantine was the author of the term Consubstantial and the Creed of the Council. [S. Athanasius informs us, that the matter was manag'd quite otherwise, in such a manner as shews us admirably well the crafty and hypocritical spirit of the Eusebians. We shall here set down what we find concerning it, as well in this Saint as in other authors.]

[2] ἀνελόντες. ω The Fathers having absolutely [2] rejected the terms invented by the Eusebians, thought proper to propose in opposition to them the uncorrupt faith of the Church. α They did not herein huddle up their sentiments, β but enquir'd with great care and deliberation into what they were to believe and order against this new heresy. γ They said all that could be said, and endeavour'd as much as they could to avoid all ambiguities and equivocations, that they might leave no pretence [for disturbance and division.]

υ d. c. 6. p. 542. c. χ Ath. dec. Nic. p. 251. b.
ϟ Socr. n. p. 6. 1, 2. ω Ath. p. 251. b. α Soz. l. 1. c. 19. p. 433. b. β Ruf. l. 1. c. 5. p. 237. γ Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 30. c.

ϡ The

δ The Council thinking to establish the Catholick faith, by saying that the Son was of God, the Eusebians said to one another: "Let us agree to that, since we have that in common with the Son;" upon which they brought several texts of Scripture: Insomuch that the Council, to take away the equivocation, was oblig'd to express the same thing in clearer terms, and to say that the Son was of the Substance of God. ε The Council thought afterwards that it was necessary to declare several prerogatives of the Son, ζ and ask'd the small number of the Eusebians if they confess'd all those things. η They did not dare to oppose them, through shame that they had been so totally routed and refuted in the foregoing disputes. But it was perceiv'd that they whisper'd, θ and wink'd with their eyes upon one another, to let them know that they could consent to them, and that there was nothing in them which could not be applied to men.

ι The Council then perceiving their hypocrisy, collected together all the Scripture expressions which related to the Son, and comprehended them all under the word *Consubstantial*, which is to say of the same Substance; κ and all the Bishops after long considering it, agreed to that term. λ It was thus that after having thoroughly examin'd all the doctrine of the Evangelists and Apostles, μ the Prelates grounding their determination upon the holy Scriptures, settled with great caution the perfect rule of the Catholick faith. ν They had likewise a more particular reason for using that term. For the Council having seen by the letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia, which we spoke of before, that the Arians look'd upon the Consubstantiality as diametrically opposite to their heresy, they were willing to make use of that sword against them which they had drawn out of the scabbard themselves.

[It seems probable that Hosius had it in charge to draw up the Creed,] ξ because S. Athanasius puts this complaint into the mouth of the Arians, that it was he who expounded the faith at Nice, and who declar'd every where

δ Ath. dec. Nic. p. 267. 268. | ad Afr. p. 935, 936. ε dec. N. p. 268. b, c. ζ ad Afr. p. 936. c. η dec. N. p. 268. c. θ c. | ad Afr. p. 736. c, d. ι dec. N. p. 268, 269. | ad. Afr. p. 936, 937. κ Ruf. l. 1. c. 5. p. 237. λ Hil. fr. 1. p. 30. μ Pheb. p. 171. b. ν Amb. fid. l. 3. c. 7. p. 159. g. ξ Ath. sol. p. 837. d.

the

the Arians to be hereticks. ο But S. Athanasius himself was one of the principal authors of it, according to S. Hilary. π S. Basil says, that the blessed Hermogenes wrote in the Council, and read the symboi of faith. ρ This Hermogenes was afterwards Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia: [and perhaps being only Deacon at that time, was made choice of to write the Creed, and read it in the Council.] σ S. Basil calls this Creed, the great and invincible Creed. τ S. Athanasius says, that it is alone sufficient to destroy all heresies. υ A great Council of Rome under Damasus calls it a bulwark oppos'd to all the efforts of the devil: φ and another Council says, that it is like a rock, against which all the waves of heresy dash and retire in froth. χ S. Hilary says, that the word Consubstantial is the great and even only means of securing our religion.

ψ The Creed concluded with condemning the doctrines and expressions of Arius; the reason of which may be seen in S. Ambrose. ω They would not in the Council examine the difficulty about the word Hypostasis, it being not worth the pains. α The Holy Ghost likewise is but just mention'd in the Creed; because there was not then any dispute or heresy upon that point: β but the little that is said of him, is sufficient to establish his divinity in opposition to all those who have denied it. γ In the Council of Chalcedon, and in Gelasius Cyzicenus, the Creed is dated several ways, [but they all place it upon June the 19th 325.] δ There are others who put the same date to the Canons, of which we shall speak hereafter: [and this is, in our opinion, the date of the beginning of the Council, and its first session.] ε For as to the Creed, it is certain that was not dated at all: [and if the Council had begun from the 14th of June, as there may be some foundation for saying, it would be hard to believe that neither the Creed nor the Canons should be made till the 19th of June.]

ο Hil. fr. 1. p. 35. π Bas. ep. 319. p. 312. a. | ep. 82. p. 154. d. ρ ep. 74. p. 125. a. | ep. 319. p. 312. a. σ ep. 319. p, 312. a. τ Ath. ad Epict. p. 582. a. υ Thdrt. l. 2. c. 17. p. 618. a. | Chry. t. 5. or. 55. p. 612. b. φ Conc. t. 4. p. 913 d, e. χ Hil. in Conf. l. 1. p. 115. 1. e. ψ Amb. de fide, l. 1. c. 8. p. 126. d. ω Socr. l. 3. c. 7. p. 175. c. α Bas. ep. 78. p. 138. d. Hier. ep. 65. t. 2. β Ath. ad Afr. p. 941. c. γ Conc. t. 4. p. 339. d. | Gel. C. l. 2. c. 27. p. 162. δ Socr. n. p. 10. 1. b. ε Ath. de syn. p. 873. a.

SECT-

SECTION X.

The Eusebians oppose the Consubstantiality; and submit, at last, for fear of banishment.

ALL the Bishops embrac'd with a wonderful consent, both of heart and tongue, the term Consubstantial, and unanimously agreed upon a formal decree of it. ν It is said, that there were only seventeen who chose rather to follow the opinion of Arius. θ They banter'd mightily the word Consubstantial, and said that they could not sign the confession of faith, because of the ill meaning they perceiv'd in that term; and at the same time they refus'd to subscribe the condemnation of Arius, [which the Council had already resolv'd upon. If we could prove the genuineness of the petition, which is attributed by Socrates to Eusebius and Theognis, we might refer to this what they are made to say in that petition;] ι That they had carefully examin'd the term Consubstantial, and that they had spoken according to the best of their judgment upon that subject, not, say they, to defend heresy, but to procure satisfaction to the Churches. κ There were several questions put and answers made for the examination of [those senses which they had given to] the word Consubstantial. But the Council depriv'd them of this false pretence,] by rejecting the ill senses in which they pretended to understand it, and declaring that it meant nothing else but that the Son of God had no resemblance with the creatures, but was in every respect like none but the Father who had begotten him, and that he was not of any other hypostasis or substance, but that of the Father alone.

λ The word Consubstantial was not expresly in scripture, and that gave a pretence afterwards to the Arians for rejecting it. μ But Eusebius of Cæsarea himself who oppos'd it at first, ν and who is call'd in the seventh General

ζ Ruf. l. 1. c. 5. p. 237. ν p. 237. | Soz. l. 1. c. 20. p. 434. c. θ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 23. a, b. ι c. 14. p. 43. d. κ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 11. p. 555. λ Ath. ad Afr. p. 937. a. μ b, c. | Thdrt. p. 555, 556. ν Conc. B. t. 5. p. 784. a, b.

Council, the chief of those who stood up against the holy Council of Nice, ξ was oblig'd to own, that some of the most eloquent and most renown'd of the ancient Bishops and ecclesiastical authors had made use of that term. ο There were, among others, the two S. Dionysius's of Rome and Alexandria. [The Arians objected likewise, that the word Consubstantial had been rejected by the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata. We have spoken of it in the history of that Arch-heretick.]

π Eusebius of Cæsarea pretends, that the explication which the Council had given of the Consubstantiality, and the love of peace made him sign it, ρ without changing his opinion; [the latter of which points seems to be very true.] σ For after he had sign'd it, he wrote a long letter to his Church, τ which S. Athanasius put at the end of one of his treatises, υ tho' it is not to be found there now; but Theodorit and Socrates have preserv'd it. φ He wrote that letter to acquaint his people with the motives which induc'd him to sign it. χ He there sets down the Creed which the Eusebians propos'd at first, ψ afterwards that which the Council had drawn up, ω with the explication of the term Consubstantial, in which tho' he may appear Catholick, yet there are several things which can fit none but Arians, α especially where he says, that the Council rejected the word *created*, speaking of Jesus Christ, because that was common to the *other* Creatures. His disguise is still more seen through in the censure of the most impious positions of Arius, β which he rejects only because they were not in Scripture. γ And if the explication of the eternity of the Son of God, which is in Theodorit, [and not in Socrates, be truly his, as there is no reason to doubt,] δ because S. Athanasius quotes it pretty clearly, [we cannot by any means excuse him from the heresy of Arius.] ε And Photius says [very well,] that he did not in this letter endeavour to regulate his opinions by those of the Council, but to make those of the Council conformable to his own.

ξ Ath. ad Afr. p. 937. c. Thdrt. p. 555, 556. ο Ath. p. 937. b. π Thdrt. p. 555. b. ρ p. 556. c, d. σ Ath. dec. Nic. p. 251. c. τ d. υ Thrt. l. 1. c. 11. p. 554, &c. | Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 23--27. φ Thdrt. p. 553. a, b. χ p. 553, 554. ψ p. 554, 555. ω p. 555. α p. 555. c. β p. 556. a, b. γ b, c. δ Ath. dec. Nic. p. 251. d. | de syn. p. 882. d. ε Eus. prol. p. 41.

[Since

[Since then it appears from his own words, that he did not change his opinion by signing, there is reason to think that he did it with the other Eusebians, and upon the same consideration with them, which was for fear of banishment.] ζ For the determination of the Council being brought to Constantine, η this prince considering that the unanimous consent of so many Prelates must be the work of heaven, θ he receiv'd it with respect, ι and declar'd that he would banish all those who should oppose it. κ Socrates even says, that he gave an express order for the banishment of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis. [But if the order was given at that time, it is certain that it was not executed till after the Council, and then for new crimes.

The Council of Ephesus informs us, that the opposition of the Eusebians to the Consubstantiality proceeded so far as to make a schism.] λ For complaining to the Emperor Theodosius II. that John of Antioch held his Council with the Easterns by themselves, it says that the same happen'd in the great and sacred Council of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers at Nice, where some separated themselves from that holy assembly, for fear of suffering the punishment due to their crimes: That the great Constantine took care not to regard that company which was separated from the others as a Council, and that he even order'd they should be punish'd for refusing to join with so many holy Prelates, whom they would not have left, if they had not known themselves to be blame-worthy.

μ It was then the fear of banishment, and the shame of having so illustrious an assembly witnesses of their disgrace, which made the Arians in haste to renounce the doctrines which had been condemn'd, ν to anathematize them, ξ and subscribe the belief of the Consubstantiality, ο after all the other Bishops, being led by Eusebius of Nicomedia to profess with their mouth the faith of the Church, without its ever entering into their heart, as the event shew'd. π Philostorgius does not disown this deceitful signing of

1 Note 8.

ζ Ruf. l. 1. c. 5. p. 238. η Soz. l. 1. c. 20. p. 434. d. θ Ruf. p. 238. ι p. 238. | Soz. p. 434. d. κ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 23. c. λ Conc. B. t. 2. p. 349. c, d. μ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 7. p. 543. b. ν c. | Ath. dec. N. p. 251. b. ξ Ath. p. 251. b. ο Ruf. l. 1. c. 5. p. 238. π Phisg. l. 1. c. 9. p. 7.

the Euſebians, and ſays frankly, that at the perſuaſion of Conſtantina [or rather Conſtantia] the Emperor's ſiſter, they conceal'd the opinion that Jeſus Chriſt is only like his Father in ſubſtance, under the true one which teaches us that he is of the ſame nature with him, ρ whether this was only in their hearts, or whether they did really write one for the other, as he plainly ſays from the report of Nicetas, [ᵗ the terms which diſtinguiſh theſe two opinions differing only in one letter in the Greek language. But whatever authority Philoſtorgius might have for confeſſing the cheat and ſhame of the leaders of his ſect, it is very probable that he was the contriver of this fact, out of a deſign of hindering people from accuſing them of playing faſt and looſe with their conſciences, and continuing afterwards to oppoſe a doctrine to which they had ſhew'd their aſſent by ſetting their hands to it. For how ſmall ſoever the difference was, between what they ſign'd and what others did, it is impoſſible but it ſhould be obſerv'd by thoſe, who no doubt carefully examin'd every thing which was done by theſe ſuſpected Prelates.

ᵗ ὁμοιούσιον. & ὁμούσιον.

The manner in which the Euſebians had defended the groſs impieties of Arius, and the proofs which there were of Euſebius of Nicomedia being no leſs impious than he, were reaſons ſufficient for his being depos'd, and even baniſh'd as an Arch-heretick, notwithſtanding any repentance he might ſhew for his fault. And it was not difficult to judge at firſt, that his ſeeming repentance was rather the effect of fear, than of any change in his heart.] ᵠ Wherefore the reproaches of his conſcience making him apprehend that he ſhould be depos'd, he employ'd ſeveral to intercede with Conſtantine, as we have obſerv'd already, for his protection: and this prince himſelf complains of his having been ſhamefully impos'd on by his artifices, and having done all things according to that deceiver's wiſh.

ρ app. p. 177. ᵠ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 19. p. 567. a, b. | c. 7. p. 543. c.

Section XI.

Arius is anathematiz'd and baniſh'd with his followers.

[WE have already mention'd by the way the condemnation of Arius by the Council. We ſhall now ſet down what we find in hiſtory concerning it. Arius having appear'd before the Biſhops, as we ſaid before, and having made them all tremble with horror and amazement at his declaring his blaſphemies, they could do no other than proceed to his condemnation. We may gueſs what that was by the ſilence of the Council,] τ who writing to the Church of Alexandria, declare that they were afraid to tell the end of that miſcreant, leſt they ſhould ſeem to inſult a man who had receiv'd the juſt reward of his crime. υ S. Athanaſius tells us in expreſs words, that he was anathematiz'd. φ The eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians confirm it: [' and the whole ſequel of the hiſtory ſuppoſes that he render'd himſelf abſolutely unworthy of the compaſſion of the Church, and that he continued under his anathema.] ' Note 9.

χ He was not only anathematiz'd, but baniſh'd likewiſe by the decree of Conſtantine, ψ and confin'd with the Preſbyters of his party to Illyricum, ω from whence he was not recall'd for a long time, not till after the death of Conſtantia, [that is about the year 330.

The Council, beſides his perſon, condemn'd alſo his writings, that is, his ſongs, [2] eſpecially his Thalia equally impious, arrogant, and infamous.] α It ſeems this perſormance was read before the Council; and all the Fathers ſtopt their ears when they heard the blaſphemies it contain'd. β For which reaſon they did not fail to condemn it. [2] See the Arians, §. 7.

γ Conſtantine join'd likewiſe his authority to that of the Church, for the ſuppreſſing of this and all the reſt of

τ Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 28. a, b. υ Ath. ap. 2. p. 778. a. & alibi. φ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 542. e. | Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 23. b, c. χ Socr. p. 23. c. | Ruf. l. 1. c. 5. p. 238. ψ Philg. app. p. 177. ω Ruf. l. 1. c. 11. p. 242. α Ath. or. 1. p. 295. d. | or 2. p. 312. c, d. β Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 30. a. | Soz. l. 1. c. 21. p. 435. c, d. γ Soz. p. 435, 436.

Arius's writings. δ For Socrates has preserv'd an edict of that prince, cited afterwards by Theodosius the younger, ε in which writing to the Bishops and all [Christian] people, he commands them to burn as many of Arius's writings as they found, and that whoever should be convicted of having conceal'd them, should be put to death. ζ He order'd moreover in the same edict, that the Arians should be call'd Porphyrians, as imitators of and accomplices with the unhappy philosopher Porphyry, η as well in his furious zeal against the Church, as in the design they all had of establishing idolatry; Porphyry by abolishing the worship of Jesus Christ, and the Arians by making that same Jesus Christ whom the Church had always worship'd, to be no God, but simply a creature.

[This is all we find that pass'd in the Council with regard to Arius. We must add one word concerning his followers.] θ The anathema which was pronounc'd against him, reach'd likewise all the partisans of his heresy. ι And it is very plain from the letter of the Council of Jerusalem to the Church of Egypt, from that of Pope Julius to the Eusebians, and from several other passages, that all those who had been excommunicated with Arius by S. Alexander, [and who are properly the Arians,] were also anathematiz'd by the Council of Nice. κ We find it of Pistus by name, λ and of Euzoïus the Deacon, afterwards Bishop of Antioch.

[3] Note 10. μ The Council itself tells us, that [3] Secundus and Theonas Bishops of Libya, were of the same stamp with their leader. ν Theodorit confirms it, and says, that as they would not submit to the determination of the Council, they were condemn'd and depos'd nemine contradicente, as having preferr'd the blasphemies of Arius before the doctrine of the gospel. ξ Philostorgius says likewise, that there were but those two who persisted in their refusal to sign the Creed of the Council; ο and he says, that they were banish'd to Illyricum with Arius. π Pope Julius

δ Bar. 325. §. 84. ε Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 32. a, b. ζ a, b. | Ath. fol. p. 844. g. | Conc. B. t. 2. p. 656. b. η Bar. 325. §. 85, 86. θ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 23. b. ι Ath. de syn. p. 890, 891. | ap. 2. p. 742, 743. | or. 1. p. 302. c. κ ap. 2. p. 743. c. λ Thdrt. l. 4. c. 19. p. 689. a. μ Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 28. b. ν Thdrt. l. 1. c. 6. p. 542. c. | c. 7. p. 545. c, d. ξ Phisg. l. 1. c. 9. p. 7. ο app. p. 177. π Ath. ap. 2. p. 743. b, c.

also

also rejected the ordinations of Secundus, because he himself had been rejected for being an Arian by the Council of Nice.

ρ Rufinus says, that there were six Bishops, who chose rather to go into banishment than subscribe the Creed. [But since the Council speaks only of Secundus and Theonas; and Theodorit and Philostorgius assure us, that excepting these two, all the rest did sign, there appears little reason for relying upon this passage of Rufinus.]

σ The Council did not condemn the heresies of Arius alone, it anathematiz'd likewise all that had ever happen'd to that time. And S. Athanasius speaks of this as a thing which ought to be observ'd by all Councils, who would condemn any new heresy. τ It is particularly observ'd, that they confirm'd there [4] the determination of the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata. [4] Note 11.

Section XII.

Decree of the Council for the reception of the Melitians.

υ AFTER having suppress'd the heresy of Arius, it was moreover requisite for the peace of the Church in general, and particularly of that of Egypt, to restrain the rashness of Melitius, and to make some regulations in relation to those whom he had ordain'd [in divers churches of Egypt, to form or support a schism there in opposition to the Catholick Bishops who govern'd them.] Melitius did not deserve pardon, according to the rigour of justice: however the Council thought proper to use him with more tenderness, φ and to receive him into the Church with his followers. S. Athanasius * speaks pretty coldly of

ρ Ruf. l. 1, c. 5. p. 238.
σ Ath. de syn. p. 873. b.
τ Conc. B. t. 2. p. 219. d.
υ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 8. p. 547. a.
φ Ath. ap. 2. p. 777. d.

* ὁπωσδήποτε ἐδέχθησαν, they were receiv'd I know not how, write or wrong.

this indulgence of the Council towards the Melitians. He adds, that it was not neceſſary to give the reaſon why they were receiv'd, χ and afterwards he ſays that it were to be wiſh'd that Melitius had never been receiv'd. [This gives us room to ſuſpect ſomething in this reception, and it may be the great love Conſtantine had for peace, made the Fathers conſider leſs than they ſhould have wiſh'd, the honour and intereſt of the Church.

In ſhort, the ſequel ſhews plainly that this reconciliation was only a feint on the part of the Melitians.] ↓ They rais'd new diſturbances againſt the Church, ω and Theodorit informs us, that in his time, [which was above a hundred and twenty years after,] the dregs of that indiſpotion remain'd in ſome ſocieties of monks.

[Whatever the reaſon was which prevail'd with the Council,] α it reſerv'd to Melitius the name and quality of Biſhop in the city [of Lycha or Lycopolis,] without any exerciſe of the function, and without the privilege either of naming or ordaining any body, whether in the city or country; β and they reſtrain'd him in this manner, for fear his turbulent and headſtrong ſpirit ſhould again embroil the Church, as it had heretofore done. [The Council having interdicted him all exerciſe of his function, it is probable that they conſtituted another Biſhop in his place, if that was not done before when S. Peter condemn'd him. It is perhaps in this ſenſe that] γ Theodorit ſays the Council [1] depos'd him. [But it is ridiculous in Socrates] δ to ſay that the ſchiſm continu'd, becauſe Melitius was depriv'd of the exerciſe of his function.

[1] ἀπεκήρυξε.

ε Thoſe whom he had prefer'd to eccleſiaſtical dignities, were us'd ſtill more tenderly; and it was order'd that after [2] they had been confirm'd [3] by religious ceremonies, they ſhould be receiv'd to communion, but upon condition that tho' they kept the honour and function of their orders, [4] they ſhould not take place but after them who had been ordain'd to that time [in the Catholick Church,] and who were ſubject to S. Alexander, [and in communion with him;] ſo that thoſe who had continu'd firm to the unity of

[2] Note 12.

[3] χειροτονία.

[4] Note 13.

χ p. 788. d. p. 548. c. p. 576. c.
↓ p. 777. d.
α p. 547. b, d.
ω Thdrt. l. 1. c. 8.
β d.
γ c. 25. p. 547. b, c.
δ Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 30. a.
ε Thdrt. p.

the

the Church, should choose and ordain those who should be worthy of church-employments, and should perform all other ecclesiastical offices; and that those who had been in the schism, should not have any power either to ordain or present any person to be ordain'd, or lastly to exercise any function without the consent of the Catholick Bishops who were [at that time] under the jurisdiction of S. Alexander: ζ That when a Catholick [Bishop] should die, they might fill his place with one of those whom they had receiv'd, [that is of the Melitians,] provided always that he should be esteem'd worthy, that the people elected him, and that the Catholick Bishop of Alexandria approv'd and confirm'd the election.

[This is what the Council order'd concerning the Melitians. S. Alexander added thereto a necessary precaution.] η For as he was afraid, lest Melitius abusing the indulgence of the Church to act according to his own pleasure, should sell new titles, and disturb the Church by his falsehoods, presenting to her every day new ecclesiasticks of his party, he ask'd him for a list of the Bishops which he said he had in Egypt, and likewise of the Priests and Deacons which he had not only in Alexandria, but in the dioceses. θ S. Athanasius gives us this list, in which there are at least twenty nine Bishops, and eight Priests or Deacons. Melitius himself presented all these persons to S. Alexander, [which doubtless was done in Egypt after the return of that Saint, tho' Melitius might have done it at Nice, if he was there,] ι as Philostorgius says, [and as it is probable he was.]

κ Of these twenty nine Bishops, the two first were Agathammon, ordain'd, says Melitius, for the country and territory of Alexandria, and John of Memphis, whom the Emperor commanded to stay with the Archbishop. [The former shews us, that the insolence of the schismaticks was so great, as to carry them even to ordain a new Bishop at Alexandria. For the latter, I know no body who tells us what it means. The only sense which can be put upon it is, that Constantine being appriz'd, it may be by S. Alexander, of the turbulent spirit of this John, order'd that he should stay at Lycha with Melitius. But in this case Melitius

ζ d. | Eus. n. p. 133. 1. d. η Ath. ap. 2. p. 788. d.
θ p. 789. a, c. ι Phisg. ap. p. 177. κ Ath. p. 789. b, c.

must

must term himself Arch-bishop, which is very strange. If this however be the sense of this passage, there is great likelihood that this is that John the Melitian, surnam'd Archaph, who was so famous in the history of S. Athanasius;] λ and whom Melitius when he died, appointed in his stead, according to Sozomen, [to be the head of the Melitians.

It cannot be doubted, according to what we have reported from S. Athanasius, but that S. Melitius accepted of the conditions which the Council offer'd him. Sozomen confirms it,] μ when he says that when S. Alexander was return'd into Egypt, Melitius surrender'd to him all the Churches which he had possess'd, and retir'd to Lycha. But he gave the Church new disturbances, when at his death, which happen'd shortly after, he set up, as we observ'd before, a successor contrary to the order of the Council.

Section XIII.

The Council orders Easter to be observ'd upon the same day: Of the Golden number, and some other regulations relating to that festival.

ν THE Council of Nice met, as we observ'd at the beginning, chiefly for these two things, the heresy of Arius, and the dispute about Easter. [We have seen what was done in relation to the former.] ξ The affair of the latter was, that some provinces of the East celebrated the feast of Easter with the Jews, contrary to the universal practice of all the other Churches of the West, the South, and the North, and even of some of the East. ο These provinces which follow'd the Jews, were Syria, Mesopotamia, and Cilicia, according to S. Athanasius. π But Constantine puts Cilicia among those who follow'd the

λ Soz. l. 2. c. 21. p. 471. c. μ c, d. ν Ath. de syn. p. 872. c, d. / ad Afr. p. 933. b. ξ Eus. v. Conc. l. 3. c. 19. p. 493, 494. ο Ath. ut. sup. π Eus. p. 494. a.

West.

West. ρ This difference caus'd much confusion in the Church, some fasting and performing the severe duties of repentance, whilst others were at ease and rejoycing for the resurrection of their Saviour. σ Sometimes the feast of Easter was observ'd [1] at three several times of the same year. And this confusion expos'd the Church every year to the ridicule of her enemies.

[1] &c.

τ The Council order'd therefore, that all the Churches should celebrate this festival upon the same day, υ after the equinox, as the 14th of the moon happen'd, φ according to the ancient custom which had obtain'd from the day of our Saviour's passion, not regarding the calculation of the Jews, χ according to which it happen'd that they sometimes kept two Easters in one year, beginning it at the equinox, and at other times none at all, which Christians ought not to suffer. ↓ The determination of the Council concerning this point, began with these words: [2] *We have resolv'd*; because it was a new ordinance, which the Council would have all the world observe; whereas the determination concerning the faith being only a testimony of the belief which the Church had always maintain'd, they put it in these words, *This is the belief of the Catholick Church: We believe in one God*; and the rest of the Creed.

[2] ἔδοξε.

ω This decree was made, and afterwards sign'd with an universal consent. α Thus the whole Church was united and agreed in this point, as well as in that of the faith; β and reap'd from the Council these two great advantages, the condemnation of Arius's heresy, and the putting an end to that dispute about Easter, which had been as troublesome as it was ancient. γ For what, says a Saint, could be more advantageous and agreeable, than to see all the Christians in the world, from one end of the earth to the other, [3] reconciling themselves to God and to each other, assembling themselves together to watch, [4] to sing hymns, to pray, to fast, using only dry food, living continently, offering to God the same sacrifice; in short, doing every thing whereby we may render ourselves accept-

[3] ἀπαλλάττειν λαὸν θεῷ.
[4] συμφωνεῖν.

ρ c. 18. p. 493. b, c. σ Epi. 70. c. 9. p. 821. c. τ Eus. p. 492. b. | c. 19. p. 494. a, b. υ Epi. 70. c. 12. p. 824. b. φ Eus. p. 492. c. χ p. 493. a. | Epi. c. 11. p. 824. a. ↓ Ath. de syn. p. 873. a. ω Eus. v. Conf. c. 14. p. 490. d. α Thdrt. l. 1. c. 8. p. 548. a. | Ath. ad Afr. p. 933. b. β Epi. p. 821. b, c. γ c. 14. p. 826, 827.

able

able to God in the religious solemnity of those holy days.

[We neeed not doubt but the Bishops of Syria and Mesopotamia, who were present at the Council, gave in to the opinion of the rest.] δ Constantine promis'd for those who were absent that they should likewise accept it; and he wrote to them upon the subject, as we shall find afterwards. ε S. Athanasius assures us, that his promise was made good with regard to Syria. ζ The Council which was held at Antioch in 341, confirm'd the decree of Nice in its first Canon, and moreover punish'd with excommunication all those who should disobey it. η S. Chrysostom testifies also, that the church of Antioch had forsaken her ancient custom herein, to follow that of others, θ and submit itself to the ordinance which the Council of Nice had made, that all the world should celebrate the feast of Easter at one and the same time.

ι This Saint made a sermon [5] against some few persons, κ who in observance of their ancient tradition, λ chose rather to follow the Jews than the determination of the Council, μ separated themselves from the Church, ν depriv'd themselves of hearing the Scriptures, of the benedictions, and common prayers which the Church had in the [first or last] days of Lent, and shut themselves up at home debauching away their time, and concealing themselves as well as they could for fear of being discover'd. [5] Note 14.

ξ This which happen'd at Antioch, was seen likewise in Mesopotamia, where the hereticks call'd Audæans continued always to follow the Jews for the time of this festival, keeping close to the ancient practice of that province, which they said was chang'd only out of complaisance to Constantine. S. Epiphanius confutes this conceit at large: ο And S. Chrysostom shews, that a Council made up almost of none but confessors for the name of Jesus Christ, could not be guilty of such base cowardice.

[As the difference which we meet with in the celebration of Easter, proceeded in part from their ignorance of the course of the stars,] π the Council order'd, as is

δ Eus. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 19. p. 493. d. ε Ath. de syn. p. 872. d. ζ Conc. B. t. 1. p. 504. η Chry. t. 5. or. 52. p. 611. d. θ p. 612. a, d. | 629. c. ι p. 609. a. κ p. 611. c. | 616. a. λ p. 612, 613. μ p. 629. b. & alibi. ν d. ξ Epi. 70. c. 9. p. 820, 821. ο Chry. p. 612. π Bar. 325. §. 110, 111.

thought,

thought, that for difficulties of that kind they ſhould have recourſe to the Biſhops of Alexandria, because in Egypt they had more ſkill in aſtronomy than in other places, and that the Biſhops of that church ſhould notify every year to that of Rome on what day Eaſter ſhould be obſerv'd, to the end that all other churches at a greater diſtance might be appriz'd of it. ρ This is collected from a letter of S. Leo to the Emperor Marcian. [S. Leo does not however ſay expreſly, that this order was made by the Council of Nice, but only by the holy Fathers; which may likewiſe mean a cuſtom authoriz'd by antiquity, and not neceſſarily that the Council of Nice, or any other, made an expreſs order for it.

And indeed, the Council ſays nothing of it in their letter to the church of Egypt, tho' that ought not to have been forgotten in the panegyrick which they make upon S. Alexander.] σ But S. Cyril ſays poſitively, that a ſynod of the Saints of all the earth had appointed, that the church of Alexandria ſhould every year give notice to that of Rome, on what day Eaſter ſhould be obſerv'd, from whence the univerſal Church ſpread over the whole earth might be inform'd of the day appointed by Apoſtolick authority for the celebration of that feaſt.

τ As early as the year 314, the Weſt learn'd from Rome on what day Eaſter ſhould be obſerv'd, as we find in the great Council of Arles, which order'd likewiſe before that of Nice, that this feſtival ſhould be celebrated every where on the ſame day. υ Pope Innocent I. meeting with ſome difficulty about Eaſter in the year 414, deſir'd Aurelius of Carthage to conſider it in his Council, and to ſend him his advice about it, to the end that he might give notice as uſual when the feaſt ought to be kept. φ We have a letter of S. Leo's dated July 28th 454, wherein he ſignifies to the Biſhops of Gaul and Spain, that Eaſter ſhould be obſerv'd in the year 455 on the 24th of April, as they had appointed in the Eaſt, and he deſires them to acquaint the other Biſhops with it. χ He notified the ſame thing to all the Biſhops of the Weſt.

ψ S. Ambroſe ſays that among other admirable and juſt ordinances, made by the Council of Nice, we have that [66] Note 15.

ρ Leo, ep. 94. c. 1. p. 628. σ Buch. cycl. p. 481. τ Conc. B. t. 1. p. 266. 2. c. υ Buch. p. 480. φ Leo, Q. ep. 109. p. 659, 660. χ ep. 112. p. 664. ψ Amb. de Paſ. t. 4. p. 303. k.

of

of the cycle of 19 years, which it made for the regulation of the feaſt of Eaſter; having call'd together for that purpoſe thoſe who were moſt ſkill'd in ſuch computations. [This cycle of 19 years was form'd upon the revolution of the ſun and moon to almoſt the ſame point at the end of that term. This is what is call'd the Golden number.] ω Dionyſius Exiguus follows S. Ambroſe. α Gennadius ſays likewiſe that the cycle of Theophilus of Alexandria, (which was that of 19 years,) came from the Council of Nice.

β S. Jerom aſcribes the compoſition of this cycle to Euſebius of Cæſarea: γ Bede does the ſame: [And it is not difficult to reconcile this; becauſe the Council might make uſe of the labour and induſtry of Euſebius in this matter.] δ It is certain that Euſebius wrote a book concerning Eaſter, which he dedicated to Conſtantine, ε and we have the letter of thanks which Conſtantine wrote to him upon that occaſion. ζ It is not difficult to believe that he treated of his cycle in it, η tho', as Baronius obſerves, it cannot be neceſſarily inferr'd: [And even the ſequel of it would incline us to judge that his book was not wrote till about the year 334. So that it would be wrong to aſcribe the golden number to the Council of Nice, or at leaſt we muſt ſay that Euſebius found it out, and preſented it to the Council in the year 325, and that he inſerted it in his book nine years after.]

Section XIV.

Of the firſt ſeven Canons of the Council.

[THere were other regulations to be made in the diſcipline of the Church, beſides thoſe relating to the feaſt of Eaſter and the ſchiſm of the Melitians. The Council took particular care to provide for it by 20 Canons which have been handed down to us.] θ Theſe 20 laws of eccleſiaſtical polity, as Theodorit calls them, were made

ω Buch. cycl. p. 485. α Genn. c. 33. p. 51. β Hier. v. ill. c. 61. p. 288. c. γ Bar. 325. §. 113. δ Euſ. v. Conſ. l. 4. c. 34. p. 542. d. ε c. 35. p. 543. ζ n. p. 245, 246. η Bar. 325. §. 113, 114. θ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 7. p. 545. d.

in

in a session posterior to that which condemn'd Arius. ι The first of these Canons relates to eunuchs. It ordains, that those who had been mutilated by the irresistible force of others, or by reason of any distemper, might be admitted into the Clergy: κ But that those who had mutilated themselves, * should not be admitted, and also that such as had been admitted, should be depos'd. λ It is suppos'd, [but upon very slender grounds,] that this Canon was made upon the account of Leontius, whom the Arians afterwards made Bishop of Antioch, μ and whose ordination was contrary to the laws prescrib'd by the Council of Nice, says Theodorit, forasmuch as he had mutilated himself.

ν The second Canon of the Council forbids receiving the Catechumens too hastily to baptism, and admitting those who had but just been baptiz'd into the Clergy, because there ought to be time for preparing the Catechumens for baptism, and a sufficient probation of those who had been baptiz'd for their reception into the ecclesiastical state. That if afterwards a cleric was convicted of any sin against his own soul by two or three witnesses, (ξ which according to Zonaras, comprehends all sins,) ο the Council orders that he should be depos'd, and that those who refus'd to do it, [and who oppos'd the criminals being depos'd,] should themselves be in danger of losing their degree. ψυχικὸν.

π The third Canon condemns a very common irregularity, by forbidding every ecclesiastick to have in his house any woman, except his mother, his sister, his aunt, or some other person who could cause no suspicion: ρ that is, according to Rufinus, his neareſt relations. σ It is pretended that Leontius's Eustolia was also the cause of this Canon. τ S. Basil urges this Canon to oblige a Priest nam'd Paregorius to part with a servant which he kept, tho' this Priest was 70 years of age, and there could be no danger of him. It appears that he suspended him from his office till he complied; and he told him that if, without obeying the order of the Church, he presum'd to officiate, both he and all that communicated with him should be anathematiz'd.

ι Conc. t. 2. p. 28, 29. κ Ruf. l. 1. c. 6. p. 238. λ Bar. 325. §. 147. μ Thdrt. l. 2. c. 19. p. 620. d. ν Conc. t. 2. p. 29. ξ Zon. in can. p. 50. a. ο Conc. p. 30. c. π d. ρ Ruf. l. 1. c. 6. p. 238. σ Bar. 325. §. 149. τ Bas. ep. 198. p. 216, 217.

* *Impatientia libidinis*, says Rufinus, *l.* 1, *c.* 6. *p.* 238.

υ The

υ The fourth Canon requires, that a Bishop shall be ordain'd by all those of the province. But it commands that three at least shall be present, and that the others shall testify their consent in writing. It adds, that the authority of what is done in every province, ought to be given to the Metropolitan; φ insomuch that, according to Rufinus, the ordination is null, if it be not perform'd in the presence or by the authority of the Metropolitan; χ which is ordain'd at the end of the sixth Canon: ↓ And Rufinus makes it the seventh. ω The Bishops of the Council of Constantinople in 382, cite this Canon with this addition, that the Bishops of the Province may call their neighbours to an election, if they think fit.

α The fifth Canon confirms the ancient rule [of the Church, broken by Eusebius of Cæsarea in favour of Arius;] That those who had been excommunicated in one place, should not be receiv'd in another. But as these excommunications are sometimes unjust, the Canon orders that two Councils in a year should be held in every Province, one before Lent, the other in Autumn, in which those excommunications should be examin'd; to the end that if they be found just, the criminals should be made known to all the world to be excommunicated, till the Council judg'd it proper to loose them. β The version of Dionysius Exiguus gives also this power to the Bishop.

γ Baronius is of opinion, that Melitius gave occasion for the sixth Canon of this Council, by the attempts he made against the authority of the Bishops of Alexandria. δ This Canon orders, that the rights and preeminences which some churches had of old, as those of Alexandria and Antioch, should be preserv'd. It regulates particularly the jurisdiction of that of Alexandria over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, by that which the Church of Rome had. ε Zonaras extends the jurisdiction of the latter over all the West. ζ Rufinus, who might be better inform'd, subjects only the suburbicary churches to it; [which has occasion'd many contests and disputes. However to act ingenuously, there is a great deal of likelihood that it comprehended Italy, excepting only Gallia Cisalpina, and the three Islands of

υ Conc. t. 2. p. 29. φ Ruf. p. 238. χ Conc. p. 32. d. ↓ Ruf. p. 238. ω Thdrt. l. 5. c. 9. p. 717. b. α Conc. p. 29, 32. β p. 40. e. γ Bar. 325. §. 123. δ Conc. t. 2. p. 32. ε Zon. in can. p. 55. a. ζ Ruf. l. 1. c. 6. p. 238.

Sicily,

Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. But it ought to be remembred, that the Council here draws the comparison between the Churches of Rome and Alexandria according to what they had in common, that is, the jurisdiction which they both exercis'd immediately over some provinces which had no ecclesiastical metropolitan, as all others had. So that whatever boundaries they set to the church of Rome in regard of that jurisdiction, it does not affect the primacy which it has over the whole Church, which she never had in common with the Church of Alexandria or any other.

After the sixth Canon has settled the authority of the Bishop of Alexandria,] η the seventh ordains in like manner, that the Bishop of Elia [or Jerusalem] should enjoy the honour which by custom and tradition he had obtain'd; but this was to be without any prejudice to the dignity of the metropolitan [of Cæsarea.] θ It is apparent that Zonaras did not well understand this Canon, when he draws this consequence from it, that the Bishop of Jerusalem was metropolitan of Palestine, Arabia, and Phœnicia. ι Baronius is more in the right in saying, that this privilege of the Church of Jerusalem consisted in this, that its Bishop had a place among the Apostolick sees: κ And Sozomen puts S. Macarius of Jerusalem, as well as Eustathius of Antioch, among the Bishops of the Apostolick thrones who assisted at the Council of Nice. It appears indeed by the history of the Church, that he had that honour: λ And as early as the great Council [z] of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, it appears that Hymenæus of Jerusalem took place before Theotecnus of Cæsarea. μ Eusebius himself, successor of Theotecnus, names them in the same order, [tho' as near as we can judge, Hymenæus was not a Bishop till after the other.] ν Eusebius names likewise upon other occasions S. Narcissus and S. Alexander of Jerusalem before Theophilus and Theoctistus of Cæsarea.

[z] See Paul of Samosata, §. 4.

ξ Constantine addresses a letter to Macarius [of Jerusalem] and the other Bishops of Palestine, which Eusebius himself acknowledges to have been for him as well as the rest, [and which did not relate to the diocese of Jerusalem.] ο Eusebius however in another place puts Theophilus be-

η Conc. p. 32. θ Zon. p. 55. ι Bar. 325. §. 140. κ Soz. l. 1. c. 17. p. 430. λ Eus. l. 7. c. 30. p. 279. c. | Bib. P. t. 11. p. 302. c. μ Eus. l. 7. c. 28. p. 279. a. ν l. 5. c. 25. p. 194. a. | l. 6. c. 19. p. 221. a. ξ v. Conf. l. 3. c. 51, 52. p. 508, 509. ο his. l. 5. c. 23. p. 190. d.

fore S. Narciſſus; and it is upon the occaſion of a Council in which it appears Theophilus preſided, [as having the juriſdiction.] π S. Auſtin makes two enumerations of the Biſhops who in 415 were at the Council of Dioſpolis, and both times puts John of Jeruſalem before Eulogius of Cæſarea: [And it is not to be doubted, but that he follow'd the order which he found in the acts of the Council.

[3] Note 16. It is harder to know, whether [3] the Biſhop of Jeruſalem was ſubject to that of Cæſarea, as his metropolitan, or whether he was independent, but without having any juriſdiction over others, as may be ſaid of him of Conſtantinople, from the ſecond General Council to that of Chalcedon. The moſt learned are divided in their opinions about it. We may ſay however, that the authorities from antiquity are moſt in favour of the rights of the Church of Cæſarea. But the reſpect which was paid to the Church of Jeruſalem,] ρ which was look'd on as the mother of all the reſt, according to the expreſſion of a Council, [carried it at laſt after the beginning of the Vth Century; and from being barely an honorary metropolis, if I may ſo call it, it became under Juvenal a Patriarchal Church, which was confirm'd in 451 by the Council of Chalcedon. The care which Euſebius took in enquiring after and ſetting down the names of the Biſhops of Jeruſalem, which he does not do for his own Church, is a mark of the reſpect which was always paid to that Apoſtolick throne, from whence all the others are deriv'd.]

Section XV.

Of the twelve laſt Canons of the Council.

[To return to the Canons of Nice, we ſhall explain [2] See §. 17. the eighth [2] when we ſpeak of Aceſius Biſhop of the Novatians.] σ The ninth deprives thoſe of the Prieſthood who had been advanc'd to it, after having been guilty [of crimes:] whether they who advanc'd them to it, were or were not ignorant of their faults, becauſe the Catho-

π Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 5, 7. ρ Thdrt. l. 5. c. 9. p. 717. d.
σ Conc. t. 2. p. 54. b, c.

lick

tholick Church would have no miniſters but ſuch as were irreproveable. The tenth is only an application of the foregoing to thoſe who had laps'd, τ that is, who had renounced the faith during the perſecution.

υ The eleventh declares them unworthy of pardon, who had renounc'd the faith without being forc'd to it, and without being expos'd to danger, as had happen'd under Licinius. It did not however hinder them from being admitted to communion, after they had for eleven years gone through the ſeveral ſtages of penance, if they were of the number of the faithful [and baptiz'd,] provided their repentance was true and ſincere. The twelfth puniſhes very ſeverely thoſe, who having quitted their offices for the confeſſion of the faith, afterwards ſet at nought that grace [of martyrdom] to which they were call'd, return'd to their employs, and courted them with much ſolicitation: φ Which could not be done [under Licinius] without renouncing the faith. χ The Council left it however to the diſcretion of the Biſhop to ſhorten the time of their penance according to the ardor of the penitent.

The thirteenth Canon ſets forth, according to the common explanation of it, [[2] and which is in all likelihood the true one,] that the Viaticum of the Euchariſt ought to be given to all that demand it at the point of death, however not without examination, [that is, not without ſeeing that they put themſelves, as much as their indiſpoſition would ſuffer them, into ſuch a condition as not to eat that divine food to their condemnation.] ↓ This Canon ſeems to have been cited by the third Council of Valentia in the year 374. [We muſt likewiſe referr to this] ω what Pope Innocent I. ſays in his letter to S. Exuperius, that the ancient cuſtom of the Church was to reconcile only thoſe who had waited till death to aſk penance and reconciliation: but that after God had given peace to the Church, it was judg'd proper to give the communion even to all who were dying, that it might be a Viaticum to them, and that the Church might not ſeem to imitate the uncharitableneſs of the Novatians.

[2] Note 17.

α The fourteenth Canon deprives thoſe Catechumens of the privilege of praying with the Catechumens for three

τ Zon. in can. p. 58. a. υ Conc. t. 2. p. 33. d, e. φ Zon. p. 59. c. χ Conc. p. 36. a. ↓ p. 905. c, d. ω p. 1255. c, d. α p. 35. c.

years, who had fallen [into idolatry or any other enormous crime.]

β The fifteenth condemns the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, who left their Churches to take others. The Council orders, that all who should do so for the future, should be sent back to their first Church. [It is thought, that Eusebius who had been translated from Berytus to Nicomedia, gave occasion to this Canon, and yet he broke it a second time, by being translated from Nicomedia to Constantinople,] γ contrary to the Canon which, says Theodorit, forbids such changes. δ When Constantine commends Eusebius for refusing to leave the see of Cæsarea for that of Antioch, he says that he observ'd the commandments of God, the tradition and rule of the Apostles, and the Canon of the discipline of the Church. [But tho' this irregularity was always condemn'd by the Church, yet it was always practis'd; because ambition being an enemy to the Church, was not obedient to her laws.]

ε The sixteenth Canon of Nice forbids the receiving into any Church all those ecclesiasticks who had left their own, and even deprives them of communion if they refuse to return. And for the Bishops who ordain a clergyman belonging to another Bishop without the consent of their brother, it declares such ordination to be null and void.

ζ The seventeenth deposes the Clergy who should practise usury or any other sordid gain unworthy of their ministry.

η The eighteenth humbles the pride of some Deacons who administred the Eucharist to Priests. It likewise forbids them to sit among the Priests, [that is, to sit in the church as Priests.] θ For S. Jerom declares that at Rome, where the Deacons most exalted themselves, the Priests sat in the church, and the Deacons stood, tho' they sometimes broke through that rule. ι Rufinus says, that the Council forbids them to give the Eucharist in the presence of Priests, allowing them to do it in their absence. [There is nothing of this in the Greek: But Rufinus in all likelihood ascrib'd this order to the Council, because it was observ'd in his time.] κ Father Lupus has collected a great

β d. γ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 18. p. 565. e. δ Eus. v. Conſ. l. 3. c. 61. p. 518. a, b. ε Conc. t. 2. p. 36. a. ζ p. 37. a. η b. θ Hier. ep. 85. p. 329. b. ι Ruf. l. 1. c. 6. p. 239. κ Lup. in can. p. 76 --- 79.

many

many things together upon this Canon about the ambition of the Deacons. [We have ſpoken of the nineteenth Canon which relates to the Paulianiſts, when we treated of Paul of Samoſata.] λ There is at the end of it an addition concerning Deaconeſſes, [ᵗ of which we do not as yet ſee any ſatisfactory meaning.] ᵗ Note 18.

μ The laſt Canon of Nice commands the univerſal obſervation of the ancient cuſtom of praying ſtanding, and not kneeling, on Sundays and the fifty days of the time of Eaſter; ν which Baronius ſays, [without much foundation] is a conſequence of the decree which the Council had made for the celebration of Eaſter on Sunday.

SECTION XVI.

Collection of ſome other orders of the Council.

[THESE are the twenty Canons of this famous Council, which are come to our hands, and are the only ones which were made. At leaſt none of the ancients reckon'd them more than twenty.] ξ Theodorit mentions no more. ο When the Church of Africa ſent to the Churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Conſtantinople for the Canons of Nice, they ſent them only the ſame twenty which we ſtill have; and the twenty two of Rufinus contain no more than theſe twenty, only they are divided after another manner. [Inſomuch that there is no room to believe that any more were made. Notwithſtanding which other things might be determin'd which were not enforc'd by the Canons. We ſee this plainly by the determination about Eaſter; and we find likewiſe footſteps of ſome others.]

π Pope Julius declares, that the Council confirm'd by a writing an ancient cuſtom of the church, which allow'd the examining in a poſterior Council what had been determin'd in a preceding one: [It at leaſt eſtabliſh'd it by its own practice, in examining anew the affair of Arius, which was a caſe already adjudg'd by the Council of Egypt.]

λ Conc. t. 2. p. 38. e. μ p. 37, 40. ν Bar. 325. §. 115. ξ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 8. p. 545. d. ο Bar. 325. §. 157. π Ath. ap. 2. p. 741. a, b.

ρ S. Austin complains of his having been ordain'd Bishop during the life of his predecessor, and of having had a seat with him, not knowing then, says he, that it was forbid by the Council of Nice, σ which in some measure agrees with what Pope Innocent I. says, τ that the Fathers forbad the choosing of a Bishop in the place of another who was still living. υ Baronius is of opinion, that this may be contain'd in some sort in the end of the eighth Canon, φ by which we may see that at the same time that the Council wish'd there might be but one Bishop in every Church, yet it tolerated the contrary for the good of the Church, χ as we have seen by what was allow'd with regard to the Melitians. ↓ The fourth Canon of the XII. Council of Toledo cites likewise the eighth title of the Council of Nice, as forbidding two Bishops to be in one city.

[It is moreover to that Canon, which receives the Novatians without re-baptizing them, that we may referr the decision of that famous dispute concerning baptism: At least we do not see, that S. Austin could mean any other Council than that of Nice, when he says that this case was determin'd before he was born by an universal Council of the whole earth, to which S. Cyprian and all others who were of his opinion, were oblig'd to submit.]

ω The epistle to the Church of Vercellæ, which undoubtedly was S. Ambrose's, says that the Council of Nice had excluded Bigamists, not only from the Priesthood, but likewise the Clergy.

α A Canon of the church of Africa seems to say, that the same Council had commanded that the Sacrifice should always be offer'd fasting; β and Zonaras understands it in this sense. [Yet this is not clear from the Canon.]

γ We find many other determinations attributed to the Council of Nice, in the pretended letters of the Popes Mark, Julius, and Felix; in a letter from S. Athanasius to Pope Mark; in Gelasius Cyzicenus; and in an Arabick collection given us by Turrianus. δ But there is nothing more plain than that all these are apocryphal; without excepting Gelasius, who we know gives us very often suspected pieces.

ρ Aug. ep. 110. p. 196. 1. b. σ Bar. 325. §. 143. τ Soz. l. 2. c. 26. p. 472. c. υ Bar. 325. §. 143. φ Conc. t. 2. p. 33. b. χ Thdrt. p. 547. b. ↓ Conc. B. t. 5. p. 374. b. ω Amb. ep. 25. p. 246. b. α Conc. B. t. 1. p. 913. 2. a. β Zon. in can. p. 434. γ Bar. 325. §. 180. δ Zon. in can. p. 434.

Pope

Pope Zosimus alledges two Canons of the Council of Nice, which allow'd Bishops and even other Ecclesiasticks to appeal to the Pope. But the Church of Africa prov'd these Canons to be forg'd; neither Zosimus nor his successors were able to prove the contrary; and it is acknowledg'd now, that these Canons belong to the Council of Sardica, and not to that of Nice.]

ε Baronius will have it, that the Council of Nice appointed a certain form for ecclesiastical letters, call'd *literæ formatæ*; and that it was sent by Atticus to the Church of Africa. But the oddness of the form, the little relation it bears to the design which the Council is said to have had, ζ as Baronius is oblig'd to own, and the little use which was made of it in the Church, with other reasons which have been urg'd η by learned men upon that point, shew that neither the Council of Nice, nor Atticus, nor Cresconius, nor any body else, ever dreamt of that form before the impostor Isidore. θ We must however confess, that before S. Basil the Fathers had appointed certain small characters, as that Saint calls them, by which the marks of communion were carried through the whole world.

ι Sozomen seems to say that the verse Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, came from the Council of Nice; [but he may be understood of the doctrine contain'd in that verse, as well as of the words.] κ For S. Basil does not ascribe that institution to any Council, but to the immemorial tradition of the Church. λ Theodorit attributes it to the Apostles themselves, when he complains that Arius had the assurance to change those words, which were a confutation of his heresy. μ Baronius pretends, that the Council added *Sicut erat* and the rest; [but he does not prove it. We must content ourselves with what we find in the second Council of Vasio in 529,] ν that at Rome, throughout the East, all over Africa and Italy, they join'd this verse to the other in opposition to the [Arian] hereticks, who said that the Son of God was not always with his Father, but began to

ε Bar. 325. §. 162, &c. ζ §. 166, 167. | Lup. in can. t. 1. p. 115. η Blond. prim. p. 467--474. θ Bas. ep. 77. p. 136. a. ι Soz. l. 3. c. 20. p. 533. d. κ Bas. de Spi. c. 7. p. 304, 305. | c. 27. p. 353. d. e. λ Thdrt. hær. l. 4. c. 1. p. 233. a. μ Bar. 325. §. 176. ν Conc. t. 4. p. 1689. e.

be in time: For which reaſon the Council order'd, that for the future it ſhould be ſung in Gaul.

ξ Baronius ſays likewiſe, as a thing certain, that the Council drew up a catalogue of the canonical books, for-aſmuch as ο according to S. Jerom, it put the book of Judith in the number of the holy ſcriptures. π But as the diſputes which have been ſince upon this ſub &, give no room to believe that the Council of Nice had ſettled it, Baronius afterwards contents himſelf to ſay, that the book of Judith was only cited by the Council in ſome paſſage which we have not.

[2] Note 19. ρ There are divers other things [2] aſcrib'd to the Council of Nice, which are only inferences drawn from the twenty Canons, [and that ſometimes without much foundation,] or elſe they are only what is to be met with in the Canons of the Council of Sardica, and others which have been join'd to thoſe of Nice, without any diſtinction: ſo that it is an eaſy matter to miſtake them. σ Whatever the Council determin'd unanimouſly, was ſign'd by every one in particular; τ and ſome modern Greeks even add, that two Biſhops who died during the Council, ſign'd miraculouſly after their death. [But a thing of this nature ought to be better atteſted before it gain credit.]

SECTION XVII.

The hiſtory of S. Paphnutius concerning celibacy: Canon of the Council relating to the Novatians.

[WE muſt not here omit the famous ſtory concerning S. Paphnutius, related by Socrates and Sozomen.] υ They ſay, that when the Council was conſidering what

ξ Bar. 325. §. 158. ο Hier. ep. 111. p. 22. d. π Bar. 325. §. 158. ρ Lup. in can. t. 1. p. 112--117. σ Euſ. v. Conſ. l. 3. c. 14. p. 490. τ Bar. 325. §. 181, 182. υ Soz. l. 1. c. 23. p. 437. c.

Canons

Canons they ſhould make for regulating the diſcipline of the Clergy, φ they had a deſign to make a new law, to forbid all who were in the Clergy, that is Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, χ and Subdeacons, ψ to cohabit with the wives which they had marry'd whilſt they were laïcks: ω but that S. Paphnutius, who was one of the moſt eminent and moſt holy among the Prelates, α and who had even always preſerv'd his virginity, β yet ſtrenuouſly oppos'd this reſolution, repreſenting to them that they would impoſe a very heavy burthen upon the eccleſiaſticks; that many of them would not be able to bear it; and that likewiſe many of the wives who ſhould be deſerted, might loſe their conjugal chaſtity; [that marriage was not a pollution, but even honourable according to S. Paul; that therefore they ſhould be content with the cuſtom which had always obtain'd in the Church, that thoſe who had been admitted into the Clergy without being marry'd, ſhould continue in that ſtate, and that thoſe who were marry'd before, ſhould not be oblig'd to part from their wives. γ Theſe hiſtorians add, that the Council follow'd his advice, δ and made no order about it, leaving every one to his liberty to do as he pleas'd, without any conſtraint from church-authority. [This is what we find in hiſtory. ι We leave it to perſons more learn'd than we, to judge both of the truth of the fact, and the conſequences which may be drawn from it.] ι Note 20.

ε As Conſtantine deſir'd to procure perfect peace to the Church [by means of the Council of Nice,] he made Aceſius come to it, who was then Biſhop of the ſect of the Novatians: [And this gives ſome room for believing that he call'd thither, with the ſame deſign, the chiefs of the other hereſies which had left the Church, tho' hiſtory makes no mention of it.] ζ Aceſius came therefore to Nice, and brought with him one nam'd Auxano, who was afterward a Prieſt of that ſect, and liv'd to the time of Theodoſius the younger. η When the Council had finiſh'd and written the Creed, and the determination about the feaſt of Eaſter, Conſtantine aſk'd Aceſius if that was his

φ Socr. l. 1. c. 11. p. 39. d. χ Soz. p. 437. c. ψ Socr. p. 39. d. ω c. α p. 40. b. β p. 39, 40. γ p. 40. b. δ Soz. p. 437. d. ε Socr. l. 1. c. 10. p. 38. c. ζ c. 13. p. 41. d. η c. 10. p. 38. c, d.

opini-

opinion. He answer'd that it was, and that he had always believ'd the one and practis'd the other. Constantine ask'd him again, why he separated himself then from the communion of the rest? He related to him what had happen'd in the time of Decius, and insisted that those who had been guilty of mortal sin after baptism, θ ought not to be admitted any more to the Sacraments; but that they should only be exhorted to repentance, and to hope for the pardon of their sins, not from Priests, but from God: ι whereupon Constantine laughing at those persons who would be impeccable, κ made him this answer: "Acesius, "make a ladder for yourself, and climb all alone to hea-"ven." λ Socrates says, that he learnt this from that Auxano whom we just now mention'd; [and we do not see any sufficient reason μ that Valesius had to reject his account.

The Council, to favour Constantine's design of quieting all disturbances,] ν order'd by its eighth Canon, that when the Novatians should return to the Church, they should be receiv'd, provided they promis'd in writing to follow all the tenets of the Church, and to communicate with Bigamists, and those who had laps'd during the persecution, according to the manner and time prescrib'd by the Church to those sinners. It even allow'd that those among them who were Clericks, should remain so after they had receiv'd imposition of hands, [which in that place may signify confirmation.] ξ For it is pretended, that those hereticks did not administer it to any. ο The Council added, that in those places where there was a Catholick Bishop, the Novatian should take place as Chorepiscopus or Priest, that he might be in the Clergy, and that there might not be two Bishops in the same Church, unless the Catholick Bishop was willing to share with the other the honour of the episcopal title. [ᵖ We see the execution of this Canon with regard to Bishops in the persons of Zoïs and Saturninus,] π who were receiv'd to the episcopal chair, as S. Basil informs us.

ᵖ Note 21.

θ p. 39. a. ι Soz. l. 1. c. 22. p. 437. a, b. κ a. | Socr. p. 39. a. λ Socr. p. 39. a, b. | c. 13. p. 41. d. μ n. p. 9. 1. ν Conc. t. 2. p. 32. e. ξ Thdrt. hær. l. 3. c. 5. p. 229, 230. ο Conc. t. 2. p. 33. a. b. π Bas. ep. can. 1. p. 22. a.

SEC-

SECTION XVIII.

Diſputes of the Philoſophers with the Prelates.

[THE fame of the aſſembly which was held at Nice, drew not only the Chriſtians thither,] ρ but likewiſe ſeveral celebrated philoſophers and ſubtil diſputants, σ who came ſome out of curioſity to learn the opinions of the Chriſtians, others to encreaſe, as much as they could, the diviſions which had happen'd among them, not bearing to ſee our religion riſe upon the ruins of their paganiſm. τ If we may believe Gelaſius Cyzicenus, it was Arius who brought them to Nice to ſupport his party.

υ Theſe Philoſophers made ſpeeches to ſeveral people, which were like ſkirmiſhes before the battle. φ But there was one in particular, who truſting to the power of his eloquence χ and the ſubtilty of his reaſoning, was every day engag'd with the Biſhops; and this engagement drew many learned perſons to be ſpectators of it. The Biſhops who defended the truth againſt him, were by no means ignorant of the art of diſputing; and yet they could not compaſs the conviction of this Philoſopher. How ſtrong ſoever the reaſons were which they offer'd, he had always ſome ſhift to evade them, and when they had hamper'd him as faſt as could be, he ſtill found ſome artifice, ſome ſleight to diſintangle himſelf.

ψ But it pleas'd God to ſhew, that his kingdom conſiſted not in words, but in power. He rais'd up an holy old man among the confeſſors, and who, as Rufinus aſſures us, was one of the Biſhops who were hearers of that diſpute, ω tho' Socrates makes him a laick. α He was however a man of unaffected ſimplicity, and as ignorant as could be [in all worldly knowledge.] And indeed his language teſtify'd as much. But he could ſay, with S. Paul, that he knew on-

ρ Ruf. l. 1. c. 3. p. 236. σ Soz. l. 1. c. 18. p. 431. c.
τ Gel. Cyz. l. 2. c. 12. p. 87. υ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 20. c.
φ Soz. p. 431. d. χ Ruf. l. 1. c. 3. p. 236. ψ ibid.
ω Socr. p. 20. c. α Ruf. p. 236.

ly

ly Jeſus Chriſt, and him crucify'd. This old man ſeeing that the Philoſopher inſulted our Prelates, and made a great ſhew of his logick, deſir'd that he might have the liberty to ſpeak, for that he had ſomething to ſay to that Philoſopher. The Prelates bluſh'd at this requeſt, fearing the rough behaviour of the Saint might be laugh'd at by thoſe polite and ingenious wits. But he ſtill perſiſted in his deſire to ſpeak, and began in theſe words: "In the "name of Jeſus Chriſt, ſaid he, learn the truth, Mr. Phi- "loſopher. There is but one God, who has made heaven "and earth, and has given a ſoul to man whom he had "made out of the duſt of the earth. He created all things "viſible and inviſible by the power of his Word, and "eſtabliſh'd them by the ſanctification of his Spirit. This "word and this wiſdom which we call the Son, in com- "paſſion to mankind who had gone aſtray, was born of "a Virgin. This Son of God by ſuffering death has de- "liver'd us from death, and by riſing again has given to "us eternal life: β And we believe that he will come "one day to judge of all our actions. Philoſopher, do "you believe this to be true?" The force of theſe words ſo ſtruck the Philoſopher, that he ſtood as mute as if he had never learnt to diſpute. He had nothing to anſwer, but that indeed all that the old man had ſaid was true. And then the Saint, "If you believe all theſe things, "ſays he to him, riſe, come with me to the Church, "and receive the mark and ſeal of that belief." And then the Philoſopher turning to his diſciples, and the reſt of the auditors, ſpoke thus to them, "Hearken, all "you who profeſs to be knowing and wiſe; as long as "they proceeded with me by words, I anſwer'd with words, "and refuted by the art of reaſoning all the reaſons "which they urg'd againſt me. But when a force more "than human came in the place of words, human "words could not withſtand that force, and man could "not reſiſt God. Wherefore if any of you could feel "what I have juſt felt in this diſpute, let him believe in "Jeſus Chriſt, and follow this old man by whoſe mouth "God has ſpoken." So the Philoſopher became a Chri- ſtian, and rejoic'd that he had been defeated. [It were to be wiſh'd, that hiſtory had given us the name of this illuſtrious old man.] γ Baronius ſays, that authors agree

β p. 237. γ Bar. 325. §. 48.

that

that it was S. Spiridio. But those authors are Metaphrastes and Glycas. ♪ For Nicephorus himself speaks but doubtfully of it: And we might notwithstanding believe it easily enough, if we did not see that Rufinus speaking afterwards of S. Spiridio, did not believe him to be the person of whom he had before told so remarkable a story, because he does not say he was. ε As for the Philosopher, Glycas tells us his name was Eulogius. ζ Sozomen relates this story, translated almost word for word from Rufinus. η It is plain Socrates touches upon it, but relates it in a quite different manner. θ It is likewise in Gelasius Cyzicenus, and other later authors. ι Gregory of Cæsarea adds, but without any likelihood, that it was such a wonderful accident as this, that made Menophantus of Ephesus, and some other Arians, consent voluntarily to the condemnation of Arius. He confounds it likewise with another pretty much like it, ι which happen'd some time after at Byzantium. κ As for this at Nice, it happen'd, according to Sozomen, before the solemn meeting which was held in the palace. λ Socrates says, that it was the evening before that meeting.

ι See S. Alexander of Constantinople.

μ Gelasius gives an account afterwards of another very long dispute, between a Philosopher nam'd Phedo, and several Bishops, who were, according to him, Eustathius of Antioch; Hosius of Corduba, who spoke, says he, by an interpreter; Leontius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; Eupsychius of Tyanæ; Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine; Protogenes of Sardica; Macarius of Jerusalem. He relates long speeches of all these Bishops; but it is suspected that he did not much trouble himself to examine whether all those pieces were genuine. He says, that this Philosopher was likewise converted. ν Valesius says, that this dispute has more the appearance of fable than true history.

♪ Nphr. l. 8. c. 15. p. 197. e.
ε Bar. 325. §. 47.
ζ Soz. l. 1. c. 18. p. 431. c.
η Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 20. c.
θ Gel. Cyz. l. 2. c. 13. p. 88--93. §. 9.
ι Sur. 10. jul. p. 160.
κ Soz. l. 1. c. 17, 18, 19.
λ Socr. p. 20. d.
μ Gel. Cyz. p. 93--159.
ν Socr. n. p. 6. 1 a.

SEC-

Section XIX.

Constantine refuses to hear the complaints of the Bishops: Letters of this prince, and of the Council.

[We must now pass to some particular stories relating to the Council, which have but little or no connexion with the body of the history.] ξ When Constantine was come to Nice in order to be present [1] the next day at the Council, ο several of the Prelates, as tho' they had been call'd together only to put an end to their private differences, π presented petitions against each other to the Emperor. [We have already observ'd, that] ρ this was probably a stratagem of the Eusebians, who would have been pleas'd with disturbances, that the Council might thereby be rendred of no use. σ Constantine at first receiv'd these petitions; τ but finding they encreas'd upon his hands, υ and that these private matters tended to the ruin of the main design, he order'd that all those who had any complaints to make, should bring their petitions to him upon a certain day which he appointed. φ And as for those which he had already receiv'd, he had them tied up and seal'd with his own seal, and commanded that they should be kept for him [against that day.]

[1] Note 22.

χ On the morrow, when he was come into the Council after the manner we have already seen, he exhorted the Bishops to continue in unity, and to excuse all misunderstandings which might be between any of them.

ψ When the day which he had appointed was come, he seated himself upon the throne, receiv'd all the papers which were presented to him, and then made a speech, which is much commended by the historians, tho' they do not all relate it after the same manner. "God, says "he to the Bishops, has made you his high-priests, and

ξ Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 20. a. 21. a. ο Soz. l. 1. c. 17. p. 430. b, c. π c. | Ruf. l. 1. c. 2. p. 236. ρ Bar. 325. §. 42. σ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 10. p. 552. b. | Socr. p. 21. a. τ Soz. p. 430, b, c. υ Ruf. l. 1. c. 2. p. 236. φ Thdrt. P. 552. b. χ Socr. p. 21. a. ψ Ruf. p. 236.

"has

" has given you authority to judge our people and our-
" ſelves. It is juſt therefore that we ſhould ſubmit our-
" ſelves to your judgments, and not take upon us to be
" your judges. God has exalted you to be as Gods to us:
" and when was it ſeen that Gods were judg'd by men?
" ω It is not even fitting that the people ſhould know the
" faults of the Biſhops, for fear that from thence they
" ſhould take an occaſion of ſcandal, and a pretence of
" ſinning with leſs reſtraint. α Refer therefore all your
" differences to him who is the judge and God of Gods,
" or rather let us forget all theſe complaints. Let us imi-
" tate the example of the divine goodneſs, in forgiving
" one another, and let us unite ourſelves together with
" brotherly affection, to enquire with one conſent and
" one heart, into the truths of the faith, for which end
" we are met together."

β It is ſaid that he added moreover, that if he ſaw a Biſhop violating the moſt inviolable laws of chaſtity, he threw his royal mantle over him, for fear the ſight of the action ſhould hurt the ſoul of thoſe who might be witneſſes of it. γ He was pretty long alſo upon the ſubject of peace and concord, exhorting them to forgive each other, that Jeſus Chriſt might forgive them; δ and he beſought them to apply themſelves with one heart and with one mind, to the determination of the difficulties concerning the faith which were then in debate. After this, he caus'd the petitions which had been juſt preſented him to be burnt, ε and thoſe alſo which he had before receiv'd, aſſuring them with an oath that he had not read any one of them.

ζ Conſtantine [2] had before ſhew'd himſelf of this pacifick diſpoſition in the firſt years of his converſion, in the affair of the Donatiſts; η and tho' he did at length conſent to examine the complaints which were made to him againſt Cecilian of Carthage, in hopes of ending the ſchiſm, he thought himſelf afterwards oblig'd to aſk pardon of the Biſhops for it: [which he might poſſibly do upon this occaſion.] θ S. Gregory the Great propos'd his

2 See the Donatiſts, §. 23.

ω Thdrt. p. 552. c. α Ruf. l. 1. c. 2. p. 236. β Thdrt. p. 552. e. γ Socr. p. 21. b. δ a, b. | Ruf. l. 1. c. 2. p. 236. | Soz. l. 1. c. 17. p. 430. d. ε Thdrt. p. 552. b. ζ Conc. t. 1. p. 1431. c, d. η Aug. ep. 162. p. 282. b. θ Greg. l. 4. ep. 31. p. 605, 606.

beha-

behaviour to the Emperor Mauritius for his imitation, with this wise reflexion: That that religious prince had done himself more honour by the submission he shew'd to the Bishops, than he did to them by that respectful behaviour; and that since the heathen princes his predecessors, who had no knowledge of the true God, but worshipt Gods of wood and stone, fail'd not to pay a great deal of respect to the priests of their false religion, he ought not to be surpriz'd that a Christian Emperor vouchsaf'd to pay respect to the high-priests of the true God.

[But it were to be wish'd, that Constantine himself had follow'd his own example, that he had always acted with only some of the moderation which he shew'd on this occasion, and that after he had thought himself not worthy to read the complaints which were made against Bishops, he had not afterwards pass'd judgment upon them with less justice than is expected from the most unreasonable judges. He would not then have condemn'd the most holy Bishops, and shew'd himself so surprizingly inconstant, which was so much the more unworthy of him, for that he knew before by experience, that the accus'd were innocent and holy, and their accusers calumniators and forgers.

We must conclude the history of the Council of Nice with the synodical epistles of this Synod which we have. For there is a great deal of probability that they were the last act of that holy assembly. We shall take in those of Constantine, which may in some sense pass for synodical ones, because they inform several churches of the determinations of the Council, and exhort them to be obedient to them. History has preserv'd two of them, one of which related by Eusebius, is also in Theodorit and Socrates.] ι Theodorit says, that Constantine wrote it to inform the Bishops who were not present at the Council of what past there. [However it is all upon what relates to the feast of Easter,] κ and there is only one word at the beginning about the definition of faith universally receiv'd; λ and tho', according to the title, it is address'd to the Churches in general, μ and Constantine sent copies of it into every province, ν yet it is plain that it relates only to those who celebrated Easter with the Jews, [that is those of Syria, Mesopotamia, and perhaps Cilicia.]

ι Thdrt. l. 1. c. 9. p. 548. d. κ Eus. v. Conſ. l. 3. c. 17. p. 492. a. λ p. 491. d. μ c. 20. p. 494. d. ν c.

ξ Con-

ξ Constantine represents to those Churches, that it is a shame for Christians to break union with their brethren, and to conform to them who put Jesus Christ to death; ο that great inconveniencies arose from the Jewish calculation, that it is a sad thing to see Christians divided in that grand solemnity; which is, says he, the festival of our deliverance; π so that he hop'd they would conform to the Council and the universal consent of all the other provinces, as he had pass'd his word they would; ρ and that when he should visit them, as he hop'd shortly to do, he should be glad to celebrate that holy festival in conjunction with them.

σ The second letter of Constantine, which we have only in Socrates, is directed to the Catholick Church of Alexandria. τ He speaks in it chiefly to those who had been seduc'd by Arius. He exhorts them to abandon that wretch, of whom he speaks in pressing terms, υ to return to the body and faith of the Church, φ and to follow the determination of above three hundred Bishops, who were to be admir'd for their piety and learning, who had done nothing but with great deliberation and exactness, and whose judgment was assuredly that of God, because his holy Spirit animated and enlighten'd them. He promises also to come and see them in a short time.

[As for the letters of the Council, tho' there were in all likelihood several of them, yet the historians have preserv'd only one,] χ directed to the Church of Alexandria, and to all the Faithful of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. The Council acquaints them with the condemnation of Arius, Secundus, and Theonas, ψ with what had been order'd about Melitius and his followers, ω and with the union of the whole Church in celebrating the feast of Easter, which, say the Fathers, has happily succeeded through your prayers. It adds, that if they had made any other regulations or determinations, their holy Bishop Alexander, on whom they make a great encomium, would apprize them thereof at his return. It exhorts them to receive

ξ c. 18. p. 492. ο p. 493. a, b. π p. 493, 494. ρ c. 20. p. 494. σ Socr. l. 1. c. 9. p. 30. b. τ p. 31. υ p. 30. c, d. φ p. 31. a, b. χ Thdrt. l. 1. c. 8. p. 546. b, c, d. ψ p. 547. ω p. 548. a, b.

that Prelate with a new esteem and charity: insomuch that we may say more certainly of this, than of all the other letters, that it was not wrote till after all things were concluded, just before the return of S. Alexander, who probably carry'd it himself.

α Baronius adds a letter of Hosius, Macarius, Victor, Vincentius, and the rest of the three hundred and eighteen Bishops, to Pope Sylvester, desiring him to call his Council, and in it to confirm that of Nice. They have join'd to this S. Sylvester's answer, which Baronius acknowledges [3] Note 23. to be spurious: [3 and the other is no better.]

Section XX.

Constantine makes a feast for the Bishops, who return to their Churches: Encomiums upon the Council of Nice.

β THE affairs of the Council being happily concluded, Constantine thought that a new victory was obtain'd over the enemies of the Church. So he return'd thanks to God for it by a feast, γ which was the more solemn, because it happen'd at the time when he enter d the twentieth year of his reign, δ which began the twenty fifth of July in this same year 325, [wherefore we see no reason to doubt but that the Council continu'd at least to that day.] ε Eusebius of Cæsarea pronounc'd at this solemnity a panegyrical oration upon Constantine in his presence, and in the midst of the assembly of holy Prelates.

ζ Constantine was willing that the Bishops of the Council should partake of this feast, and [1] &c. he entertain'd them all in his palace. η He made the chief of them sit at his own table, and the rest at other tables on each side of his, θ which Eusebius takes notice of as an extraordinary favour. ι Constantine having observ'd, that some Prelates had lost their right eye, and knowing that punishment to have been

α Bar. 325. §. 171. β Euf. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 14. p. 490. d. γ c. 14. p. 491. a. δ n. p. 223. 2. d. ε l. 1. c. 1. p. 405. a. ζ l. 3. c. 15. p. 491. a, b. η b, c. | n. p. 224. 1, 2. | Thdrt. l. 1. c. 10. p. 551. d. θ Euf. p. 491. b. ι Thdrt. p. 551. b.

inflicted

inflicted on them for the stedfastness of their faith, he kissed their wounds, hoping to receive some eminent blessing from the touch of them. κ This is said particularly of S. Paphnutius, whom he made to come often into his palace, by reason of the great respect he bore him, λ and he kiss'd with more than ordinary satisfaction the eye which he had been depriv'd of in the persecution.

μ After the feast, he made several presents to the Bishops, ν according to the merit of each of them, ξ and he gave them letters, 2 ordering that every year a certain quantity of corn should be given in every Church to the ecclesiasticks and the poor.

2 See Constantine, §. 59.

ο At last, the Fathers being ready to depart, Constantine call'd them all together to take his leave of them. π He made a very handsome discourse to them, exhorting them to the love of peace among themselves, to banish envy and jealousy from the hearts of the inferiors, and 3 pride and domineering from those who had superior qualifications; to pardon the inadvertent failings of each other; and lastly to labour with all their might to convert the Infidels, by the esteem they might have for the sanctity and glory of the Church. He desir'd them to be careful to pray to God for him, and then he left them to return every one to his Church. They went home with a great deal of joy: And it was very agreeable to see those who liv'd at the greatest distances from each other united in one body; and the faith which they had settled in the presence of the prince, reign, [at least in appearance,] over all the earth, and be unanimously receiv'd by all the world.

3 &c.

ρ Gelasius says, that there were several Bishops chosen by the Council to go and publish their decrees throughout the world; namely, Hosius, with the Priests of Rome Vito and Vincentius, at Rome, in Italy, Spain, and all the other provinces of those parts; S. Alexander of Alexandria, with S. Athanasius, in Egypt, Libya, and as far as India; S. Macarius of Jerusalem, with Eusebius of Cæsarea, in Palestine, Arabia, and Phœnicia; S. Eustathius of Antioch in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Cilicia; John Bishop

κ Socr. l. 1. c. 11. p. 39. c. λ Ruf. l. 1. c. 4. p. 237. μ Thdrt. p. 551. | Euf. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 16. p. 491. c. ν Euf. p. 491. c. ξ Thdrt. p. 551, 552. ο Euf. v. Conf. l. 3. c. 21. p. 494, 495. π p. 495. ρ Gel. Cyz. l. 2. p. 200--202.

of Persia, in Persia and the larger Indies; S. Leontius in Cappadocia, Gelatia, Pontus, Paphlagonia, and the two Armenia's, the greater and the less; Theonas of Cyzicus, with Eutychius of Smyrna, and Marinus of Troas, in the [lesser] Asia, Hellespont, Lydia, and Caria; Alexander of Thessalonica, in Macedonia, all Greece, the province of Europe, Scythia, and Illyricum; Nuneches of Laodicea, in Phrygia; Protogenes of Sardica, in Calabria, says Gelasius, Dardania, and the neighbouring countries; Cecilian of Carthage, in Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania; Pistus of Marcianopolis, in Mysia, the nations of the Germans and Gauls, says Gelasius, and in the neighbouring cities; S. Alexander of Constantinople, with S. Paul, then a Reader, and afterwards his successor, in the Isles call'd the Cyclades.

[It were to be wish'd, that this account of Gelasius were better authoriz'd than it is.] σ We can only find, that Cecilian carry'd the Canons of Nice into Africa, and that that copy serv'd as a rule for the holy decrees which were afterwards made in that province. It is said, that he carry'd them to the Council of Africa: [which is remarkable:] τ For there was likewise a Council at Rome under Sylvester which confirm'd the decrees of that at Nice, under pain of anathema against all those who should break them. [But it is not at all probable,] that there were, as is pretended, two hundred and seventy five Bishops at this Council: [there is no likelihood] it should call the Council of Nice an assembly of three hundred and eighteen Bishops, υ and it is certainly false, by Baronius's own confession, that Constantine was present at it. [Wherefore all the decrees which have no authority, but from this Council, have none at all; besides that there are some of them which look very suspicious in themselves.

We have not remaining now either the history or the
4 Note 24. 4 acts of the Council of Nice. And there is even a good deal of probability that there never were any; but that the Council contented itself with committing to writing the confession of faith, the Canons, the decree concerning the feast of Easter, and some other principal acts which were to be authoriz'd by the subscriptions of the Bishops.

σ Conc. t. 1. p. 1592. e. τ p. 410. e. υ Bar. 325. §. 199

This

This is all that we are able to say of this first General Council.] φ The Fathers have extoll'd the excellency and majesty of it with very great encomiums. Baronius reports some of them taken from S. Leo. χ S. Athanasius says, that this is the only one, in the opinion of the whole Church, that deserves the name of a Council; that it triumph'd over all heresies; ψ that it was alone sufficient to ruin them all, and to establish all the points of the Christian faith; ω that it was known as far as the Indies, and in all other the most barbarous countries where there are any Christians. α The Council of Sardica is displeas'd with all who would add any thing to the Nicene Creed, as tho' it were not already perfect. [And as long as that of Ariminum continu'd firm to the truth, it preserv'd the same respect for the Council of Nice,] β as it testifies in very remarkable terms. [We may add to this what S. Ambrose says,] γ that neither the sword nor death shall ever separate him from that Council. δ S. Phebadius of Agen, a few years before S. Ambrose, had with high encomiums extoll'd its exactness in settling the perfect rule of faith, and its care in suppressing the first seeds of Arianism.

[It would be easy to find many other encomiums upon the Council of Nice in the ecclesiastical records: but that would be endless, no one having ever mention'd that holy assembly, but with extraordinary marks of value and respect. I shall content myself with only adding what] ε S. Chrysostom says, that it would be equally ridiculous to accuse that Council either of ignorance or fear, and he represents it as made up of Saints and Confessors. ζ Wherefore it ought not to appear strange, that the Greeks have a general commemoration of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers of Nice on the 29th of May η or the Sunday before Pentecost, and the Syrians in the month of July, according to Genebrard. θ The Egyptians celebrate them on the fifth of November. ι Gregory, Priest of Cæsarea,

φ §. 183, 184. χ Ath. ad Epict. p. 582. b. ψ ad Afr. p. 932. a, b. ω p. 932. d. α ad Ant. p. 576. c, d. β de syn. p. 877. c. d. γ Amb. ep. 13. p. 204. m. δ Bib. P. t. 4. 1. p. 171. b, c. ε Chry. t. 5. or. 52. p. 612. ζ Bar. 325. §. 185. η Canis. t. 2. p. 783. Eus. n. p. 224. 1. c. ι Typic. p. 94. 3. θ Boll. 26. feb. p. 639. b. Sur. 10. jul. p. 161. §. 11.

adds, that in his time their merits protected the city of Nice against all the power of the Persians, who attack'd it every way, without being able to take it: upon which account, when any captive said he was of Nice, they durst not do him any mischief.

NOTES

NOTES
UPON THE
HISTORY
OF THE
Council of *NICE.*

NOTE I. referr'd to in §. 1. p. 597.

Upon the day on which it was held.

IN the Council of Chalcedon and in Socrates, the year of the Council of Nice is ſaid to be the 636th of the æra of Alexander, [λ] and in the Alexandrian chronicle the 295th from the Aſcenſion; [which we leave to be diſcuſs'd by the more learned, as well as the other epocha's] [μ] by which the ſame chronicle fixes the twentieth year of Conſtantine, [which is that of the Council of Nice.]

κ *Conc. t.* 4. *p.* 339. *d.* | *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 13. *p.* 43. *b.* λ *Chr. Al. p.* 658. μ *p.* 660. 662.

υ As to the day, Socrates ſets down the 20th of May, ξ and the Council of Chalcedon the 15th of June; which is follow'd by the Alexandrian chronicle *p.* 658. ο This may be reconcil'd by the different actions of the Council, which were certainly done on different days. π But Baronius quotes a manuſcript annotation, the author of which ſeems to be Atticus Biſhop of Conſtantinople, which ſays that the Council laſted from the 14th of June to the 25th of Auguſt. [It is poſſible the Council might be ſummon'd to meet on the 20th of May, and yet not be held till ſome time after.] ρ However, Valeſius chooſes rather to believe, that Socrates was deceiv'd by ſome copy, which put down the 13th of the Calends of June inſtead of July. σ Conſtantine was at Nice the 23d of May according to the Code; [but we can conclude nothing certain from thence.

If we do not receive any other epocha, than] τ the 19th of June, ſet down in the Council of Chalcedon and in the Alexandrian chronicle, [it is very eaſy to ſay, that that was the day which was nam'd for the Council, and on which it actually began; after which we ſhall be at liberty to make it continue as long as ſhall be neceſſary; and we do not ſee how it is poſſible to doubt but that it continued till after the 25th of July, on which day the 20th year of Conſtantine began.

But if we join to this epocha] υ that which Baronius takes from Atticus, [and which we ſhall not reject without neceſſity,] that the Council continued from the 14th of June to the 25th of Auguſt, [it will not be ſo eaſy to adjuſt matters: For what will become of the 19th of June, which is ſet down as the proper epocha of the Council? It is prefix'd in that of Chalcedon to the Nicene Creed: but S. Athanaſius aſſures us, that there is no date put to that Creed. And it is not eaſy to ſay that it was ſign'd the 19th, if the Council did not begin till the 14th. For it was in all likelihood more than five days before they proceeded ſo far. And as the ſettling of that Creed was the concluſion of the affair of the Arians, which ſeems to have been more fully diſcuſs'd than any thing elſe, as being that of the greateſt importance and difficulty; if this matter was ended in five days, upon what was the Council employ'd for more than two months, which it continu'd afterwards? We ſee in the Councils of Epheſus and Chalcedon, how deſirous the Biſhops were to conclude buſineſs, and return to their Churches.

I ſee but two things that can be ſaid; one, that the Council having been ſummon'd for the 14th of June, did not however begin till the 19th: the other, that ſuppoſing it to have begun on the 14th, there paſs'd only ſome particular preliminary diſputes, without a ſolemn and regular ſeſſion, till the 19th appointed for the deciſion, when Conſtantine came to the Council. But in this caſe it muſt be ſaid, that the oppoſitions of

υ *Socr. p.* 43. *b.* ξ *Conc. t.* 4. *p.* 339. *d.* ο *Bar.* 325. §. 13. π §. 8. ρ *Socr. n. p.* 10. 1. *b, c.* σ *Cod. Th. chr. p.* 25. τ *Conc. t.* 4. *p.* 339. *d.* | *Chr. Al. p.* 658. υ *Bar.* 325. §. 8.

the

the Euſebians and the other difficulties on the affair of Arius made the deciſion of it be deferr'd a pretty while, whether it was that Conſtantine was preſent at all the intermediate ſeſſions, but with leſs pomp and ſolemnity than at the firſt, or whether he was only preſent at ſome of them. This laſt ſolution agrees beſt with the letter of the paſſage aſcrib'd to Atticus. But on the other hand, the former is confirm'd by Socrates,] φ who does not make Conſtantine come to Nice, till after he had made rejoycings for his victory over Licinius: χ and this paſſage of Socrates is copied by Gelaſius Cyzicenus. [For the only victory to which this can be apply'd, was that of the 3d of July 323.] And indeed the Faſti of Bucherius, ſet down upon this very day, *p.* 283, *fugato Licinio*, [which ſhews that there was a ſolemn remembrance made of it. So that if Conſtantine was at Nice on the 19th of June, it muſt be ſaid that he obſerv'd that ſolemnity near a month ſooner than ordinary. As we ſee no neceſſity to ſtrain hiſtory in this manner, we thought it beſt to keep to the firſt ſolution.]

NOTE II. referr'd to in §. 2. p. 598.

Upon the number of Biſhops that aſſiſted at it.

ϟ EUſebius in the life of Conſtantine ſays, there were upwards of two hundred and fifty Biſhops at the Council of Nice; ω but Socrates and Gelaſius Cyzicenus, quoting this very paſſage, read upwards of 300. α S. Euſtathius of Antioch ſays they were about two hundred and ſeventy; but he does not exactly know the number; β and Theodorit who recites his words, ſcruples not to ſet down three hundred and eighteen. γ Pope Julius makes them three hundred. δ S. Athanaſius ſometimes ſays there was about that number, ε and ſometimes he puts down three hundred and eighteen. ζ This number is to be met with likewiſe in the epiſtle of the Council of Egypt to Jovian, according to the text of it in Theodorit. The ſame number is mention'd by Euſebius's Chronicon, by S. Optatus, *l.* 4. *p.* 79, by S. Epiphanius *hær.* 69. *c.* 11. *p.* 375. *b*, by S. Ambroſe *de fide*, *l.* 1. *c.* 9. *p.* 126. *e*, by Rufinus l. 1. *c.* 1. *p.* 236, by S. Hilary *in Conſ.* *l.* 1. *p.* 116. 2. *c*, by S. Sulpitius Severus, *l.* 2. *p.* 154, η by a great Council at Rome under Damaſus, [and

φ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.* 20. *a.*
ϟ *Euſ. v. Conſ. l.* 3. *c.* 8. *p.* 487. *c.* 19. *a*, *d.* | *Gel. C.* l. 2. *c.* 5. p. 69. 543. *a.*
δ *dec. Nic. p.* 251. *a.* | *ſol. p.* 854. *b.*
ζ *Thdrt. l.* 4. *c.* 3. *p.* 663. *c.*
χ *Gel. Cyz. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 70.
ω *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.*
α *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 7. *p.*
γ *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 742. *c.*
ε *ad Afr.* p. 932. *e.*
η *l.* 2. *c.* 17. *p.* 618.

in

in abundance of other places, without mentioning the later authors who have receiv'd it as altogether certain and indubitable. We may ſay that thoſe who talk of about three hundred are not far from the matter,] and thoſe yet leſs who reckon upwards of three hundred, as S. Jerom *in Lucif. p.* 144. *d*, Lucifer *de regibus apoſt. Bibliothec. Patr. t.* 9. *p.* 1044. *a*, and Conſtantine himſelf in Socrates *l.* 1. *c.* 9. *p.* 30. *d*; θ or 315, as Marius Victorinus *Bibl. Patr. t.* 4. 1. *p.* 224. *a*; or about 320 at leaſt, as Sozomen *l.* 1. *c.* 17. *p.* 430. *b*.

As to what Selden in his Notes upon Eutychius *p.* 71, *&c.* quotes from ſome modern Oriental authors, that there were to the number of two thouſand and forty eight Biſhops in the Council of Nice, of which three hundred and eighteen only ſign'd the Conſubſtantiality; [it is a matter which is equally refuted both by itſelf and its authors,] whatever Selden may ſay, ι and Eckellenſis after him, to render it ſomewhat probable, notwithſtanding the authority of S. Athanaſius, which Selden *p.* 82, owns is contrary to it. The ſame Engliſh man *p.* 78, 79, quotes from another writer, who pretends he liv'd at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, that there were but two hundred and thirty two Biſhops there, and eighty ſix Prieſts, Deacons, or Monks. He quotes the ſame thing from one Dorotheus of Monembaſus. [Whoever was the author of this notion, it is ridiculous to pretend that the Prieſts and Deacons were fewer than the Biſhops:] κ and Euſebius aſſures us, that the number of them was in a manner infinite.

NOTE III. referr'd to in §. 2. p. 599.

Of the ſlender authority of all the ſubſcriptions of this Council.

λ THE ſubſcriptions of the Council of Nice which we have in the General Councils, are mightily alter'd, as Binius himſelf, and the others who have given them us, acknowledge. The manuſcripts in which they are found, are altogether corrupted, and very different from each other; inſomuch that Binius was hardly prevail'd on to inſert them in his edition. They are divided according to provinces, [and therefore if they were authentick themſelves, the order of them would not be ſo.] μ They reckon in all but two hundred and twenty four Biſhops or Chorepiſcopi, inſtead of the three hundred and eighteen Biſhops that ought to be there; ν and they omit ſeveral Biſhops who

θ *a.* ι *Coac. t.* 2. *p.* 401, 402. κ *Euſ. v. Conſ. l.* 3. *c.* 8. *p.* 487. *c*, *d.* λ *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 50. *c*, *d.* μ *Seld. in Euty. p.* 87. ν *Lup. in can. p.* 122.

we

we know by hiſtory were there, as S. James of Niſibis, S. Spiridio, S. Paphnutius, [S. Alexander of Byzantium,] and others. ξ Narciſſus of Neronias and Narciſſus of Irenopolis are ſet down as two different Biſhops of Cilicia, ο tho' Neronias and Irenopolis are but one and the ſame town. [Inſtead of Marcellus of Ancyra, who we know moſt certainly was at the Council,] π we read in the ſubſcriptions one Pancarius or Pancratius. There is put in the margin *al. Marcellus* or *Marcus.* [But if theſe names are to be met with in the manuſcripts, why did they not remove Pancarius, which is a certain fault, and inſert Marcellus? We ſhall examine under S. Euſtathius] ρ the ſubſcription of Zeno of Tyre, and ſhall ſhew that it is very difficult and perhaps impoſſible to defend it, it being certain that Paulinus was Biſhop of Tyre at that time.

σ In the ſubſcriptions we meet with Theodorus Biſhop of Tarſus, τ who according to Suidas was the younger brother of Auxentius Biſhop of Mopſueſtia. υ This Auxentius was alive in 360. [So that he could not be Biſhop till after Macedonius, who did not die till the year 347 at ſooneſt.] φ And yet it is clear enough according to Suidas, that Theodorus was not made Biſhop till after Auxentius. [We muſt then give up either Suidas or the ſubſcriptions, tho'] χ Baronius ſeems willing to follow both. [What Suidas ſays, comes very probably from Philoſtorgius. There is likewiſe ſome difficulty concerning Macedonius of Mopſueſtia.] ψ This Biſhop was famous among the party of the Euſebians as early as the Council of Tyre, [in the year 335, and he muſt be very conſiderable among them,] ω for they made him paſs for a confeſſor. And yet we do not find that any perſon reckons him among thoſe of that ſect who aſſiſted at the Council of Nice, not even Philoſtorgius: [ſo that it may juſtly be doubted, whether he was really there.]

α Alphonſus of Piſa has pretended, that all the ſubſcriptions of the Council were found at Vienna, in a manuſcript of John Sambuc, Hiſtoriographer to the Emperor. But Sambuc himſelf could not furniſh a friend of his nam'd Laurentius Schrader, in 1583, with above twenty ſubſcriptions, confeſſing at the ſame time that the reſt, both at the beginning and end, were eaten by moths. Selden has given us them, and Father Labbé put them afterwards into his edition of the Councils, *t. 2. p.* 54, 55. But he ought to have told us, as Selden has done *p.* 128, that it is impoſſible to believe they belong to the firſt Nicene Council. Selden ſhews it by this form, *Juſtin by the grace of God Biſhop of Tyanæ:* and others of the ſame ſort. [He might add, that we ſee there divers provinces which were not in being at the time of Conſtantine, as Cappadocia ſecunda, Cilicia ſecunda, &c. Juſtin ſtyles himſelf Metropolitan of Tyanæ, which was not a

ξ *Conc. t. 2. p.* 52. *b, c.* ο *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *p.* 542. *b.*
π *Conc. p.* 52. *c.* ρ *p.* 51. *c, d.* σ *p.* 52. *b.* τ *Suid.*
α. *p.* 492. *b.* υ *Phiſg. l.* 5. *c.* 2. *p.* 78. φ *Suid.*
p. 492. *f.* χ *Bar.* 325. §. 38. ψ *Ath. ap.* 2. *p.* 796,
d. &c. | *Blond. prim. p.* 481. ω *Hil. fr.* 2. *p.* 26. α *Seld.*
in Euty. p. 88, 127.

Metro-

Metropolis till Valens's reign; and there are likewise many others more modern, which shew at least that they could not belong to the first Council of Nice. *See S. Nicholas, Note 2.* We pass by many other things which we might urge against these subscriptions.]

β Selden gives us others taken from one Josephus Ægyptianus, an Arabick writer, who lived about the year 1400. They are different from the common ones both in the order and the names, γ there being very few of those which are read in ours. [The question is whether they are more genuine. Father Labbé doubtless did not think them so, since he refus'd to give them a place in his Councils, *p.* 54, *d*, *e*.] δ And Selden himself allows, that there are many things in them which he does not comprehend. ε We find there three hundred and eighteen names of Fathers, as the title promises, but among them there are some Priests, divers Chorepiscopi, and several Bishops of one and the same see.

ζ This is no objection with Selden, η because, says he, there were several Catholick and heretical Bishops in one and the same town. [But he will not persuade us, either that since the union of the Jews with the Gentiles, there were several Catholick Bishops in one and the same Church, except in some very extraordinary cases; or that heretical Bishops ever had a place in the Councils and among the Fathers of the Church.] θ He does not make so much as sorry answers to what he owns, that several orthodox Bishops are wanting in his subscriptions, who we know from the historians assisted at the Council. ι He forms to himself a difficulty concerning Alexander of Constantinople, who is there nam'd the third; whereas according to all the modern Greeks, Metrophanes was then Bishop. [But this difficulty is easy solv'd, since all these Greeks are mistaken. One might raise a more real one upon the eminent station given to Alexander who was not a Metropolitan, and upon the name of Constantinople which was not then in being. This proves at least these subscriptions to have been alter'd, and not taken from the original of the Council.] κ The subscription of S. Sylvester, Pope, [proves also the same thing.] λ And the Priests of Rome Vito and Vincentius, who are set down by themselves long after, as making part of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers, [shew that they did not pretend that S. Sylvester only assisted there and subscrib'd by them.] μ Alexander of Thessalonica is there nam'd the forty ninth and the hundred and ninth. [And this, I think, is enough to shew that we need not trouble ourselves much with these subscriptions,] ν nor amuse ourselves with enquiring after some Bishops of England, as Selden does.

β *p.* 88, 115. γ *p.* 123. δ *p.* 88. ε *p.* 90, 115.
ζ *p.* 116. η *p.* 85. θ *p.* 123, 124. ι *p.* 116.
κ *p.* 91. λ *p.* 94. μ *p.* 95. 99. ν *p.* 117.

NOTE

NOTE IV. referr'd to in §. 2. p. 599.

Whether Hosius assisted at the Council as the Pope's legate.

[GElasius Cyzicenus, who liv'd at the end of the fifth century, is the first we find who says that Hosius was the Pope's legate in the Council of Nice, with the Priests Vito and Vincentius. [He even reports this fact as a thing very authentick,] ο since he inserts it into the text of Eusebius, as if it belong'd to it. [But it is not found there in the printed copies. Valesius takes no notice of any thing like it in the manuscripts. And it is even evident that the text of that historian cannot be read, as Gelasius quotes it, without a manifest corruption and perverting his sense.

All that can be said of this pretended delegation of Hosius, is that all the historians mention his assisting at the Council of Nice, and speak of legates who were sent thither by the Pope; but that no author more ancient than Gelasius, nor perhaps any more modern who is worth notice in this matter, puts Hosius in the number of those legates.] π Even the Synodicon, which in other respects is full of faults, does by no means place Hosius among the Pope's legates. ρ Photius seems willing to make him one of them, [but he commits many other mistakes in that passage, which shew that how learned soever he might be, he was not sufficiently acquainted with the history of that time.] σ Hosius is plac'd the first in the common subscriptions of the Council, but without any mark of delegation, whereas Victor and Vincentius, who are plac'd immediately after, declare that they subscrib'd in the name of the venerable Pope Sylvester their Bishop. Pope Julius likewise says, that his Priests who had been at the Council, had given testimony to the faith of Marcellus of Ancyra; and he does not join Hosius with them. And ought not he also to have gone and given such an account to the Pope, had he been his legate?]

τ Baronius alledges a letter from the legates of S. Sylvester to desire a confirmation of the Council of Nice, wherein Hosius is compriz'd. Without examining whether this letter be genuine or spurious, Baronius confesses, that it is very faulty and interpolated. But he forgot to make S. Macarius also a legate from the Pope, υ for he is nam'd in it as well as Hosius, tho' Baronius does not mention him in the passage where he treats of this matter. Neither does he say, that those who have endeavour'd to explain the sense of that letter, have added in

ξ *Gel. Cyz. l. 2. c. 5. p. 68.* ο *p. 67. b. | 69. c.* π *Conc. t. 2 p. 84. b, c.* ρ *p. 100. a, b.* σ *p. 50. c.* τ *Bar. 325. §. 20.* υ *Conc. t. 2. p. 58. c.*

the

the title of it *cæteri episcopi* 318. [So that if this letter be genuine, it would make somewhat for Hosius's being the President, and nothing for his being a legate.]

NOTE V. referr'd to in §. 3. p. 604.

That S. Amphion of Epiphania was not translated to Nicomedia.

Φ BAronius seems to say, that the Greeks observe the festival of S. Amphion of Epiphania, *agunt de eodem Græci*. And yet it is not in the Menæa upon the 12th of June, on which day he has plac'd it in the Roman Martyrology, and it is not at all in the Menologium of Canisius.

χ Baronius says also, that this Amphion is the same with him who succeeded Eusebius of Nicomedia. [This is altogether without grounds, and there is no probability that after the Canon, which the Council of Nice had made against translations of this sort, seemingly upon the account of Eusebius of Nicomedia, the same fault should be committed three months after, and even in the same see of Nicomedia. Constantine, who caus'd Eusebius to be depos'd,] ψ declar'd himself absolutely an enemy to these translations in the affair of Antioch. [Besides, this would be a reflection upon the memory of S. Amphion,] ω for he of Nicomedia, [who was restor'd without doubt when Eusebius made himself Bishop of Constantinople,] was living in 347, among the Eusebians, and in their communion; [so far are we from seeing that he ever did any thing against them.] S. Athanasius styles him whom he commends in 356, Bishop of Cilicia, and not of Bithynia, where Nicomedia was.

NOTE VI. referr'd to in §. 7. p. 616.

Who was the Bishop that made the speech to Constantine upon his coming into the Council.

α IT is very much disputed who the Bishop was that sat uppermost on the right hand, and made a speech to Constantine in the Council of Nice. The title of the chapter in which Eusebius tells us this, says it was Eusebius himself, β and Sozomen confirms it. γ Valesius defends it by two reasons, the

Φ *Bar.* 12. *jun. e.* *Conc. l.* 3. *c.* 60-62. *p.* 516. *Conc. l.* 3. c. 11. *p.* 489. *a.* γ *Eus. n. p.* 223. 1. *c.*

χ *c.* 325. §. 34. ω *Hil. fr.* 2. *p.* 6. β *Soz. l.* 1. c. 19. *p.* 433. *c, d.*

ψ *Eus. v.* α *Eus. v.*

one,

one, that Eusebius pass'd for the most learned and most eloquent Bishop of that time; δ the other, that he himself declares that he spoke a Panegyrick upon Constantine for his twentieth year, when that Prince was in the midst of the assembly of God's ministers; which evidently denotes the Council of Nice.

[But it is easy to suppose he made this discourse upon some other occasion, and not at the beginning of this session, to which a long and tedious Panegyrick, such as Eusebius was wont to make, does not seem agreeable. A very short compliment only was needful, for which his great learning was no wise necessary. For as to his eloquence, there are few people at present who have much regard for it. Neither is there any likelihood that the Council would have chosen a Bishop suspected or convicted of Arianism, to speak in their name; and the right he had to hold the first place, or at least the second, not to dispute with Baronius,] ε who will have the first place to have been on the left hand, is yet less evident. This Cardinal [and other judicious persons] believe, that Eusebius had too much vanity not to epxress himself more clearly if it had been he.

[Theodorit also, who was of Antioch, and very well inform'd of what had pass'd with reference to the Prelates of that Church,] ζ says, that it was S. Eustathius of Antioch who spoke the first before Constantine, and who recompens'd the love he bore to the Church with his encomiums. η We have likewise the harangue which Gregory the Priest puts into his mouth upon this occasion. θ Baronius and Mr. Hermant have followed this opinion, and we have seen that there are authorities and reasons to believe, that S. Eustathius presided in the Council. For it is natural to think this harangue should be made by him who presided. ι It is pretended also, that as in this harangue S. Eustathius might possibly speak against Arius, and in reality did so, according to some authors, κ S. Jerom signify'd this when he said, that this holy Bishop of Antioch was the first who sounded the trumpet and gave the signal of battle against Arius. [The words *qui Antiochenæ Ecclesiæ Episcopus*, seem to oblige us to say, that this was actually after he was Bishop of Antioch, and therefore in the Council of Nice: For S. Philogonius his predecessor having already declar'd openly against Arius, S. Eustathius could not in this sense pass for the first.]

λ Nicetas advances a third opinion, namely that it was S. Alexander of Alexandria, which he quotes from Theodorus of Mopsuestia, [and the authority of so ancient a witness would be very considerable, if we had his works to examine what Nicetas quotes from thence. The order of sitting, which makes against Eusebius, is favourable enough to this last opinion;] μ for Dioscorus of Alexandria was also the first on the right hand in the Council of Chalcedon. [And how old soever S. Alexander was, he had strength enough to make a speech, especially if it be that]

δ *l.* 1. *c.* 1. *p.* 405. *a.* ε *Bar.* 325. §. 56--59. ζ *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *p.* 541. *c.* η *Sur.* 10. *jul. p.* 156. §. 6. θ *Bar.* 325. §. 54. ι §. 55. κ *Hier. ep.* 126. *t.* 3. *p.* 38. *d.* λ *Euſ. n. p.* 223. 1. *c.* μ *Bar.* 325. §. 57.

ν which

ν which Gregory of Cæsarea recites, who ascribes it to S. Eustathius. For 'tis a very short discourse, in which the author after having given thanks to God for the piety of Constantine, and the good he had done to the Church, lays down a very plain and clear abridgment of the faith in the Consubstantiality of the three Persons, and concludes with desiring the assistance of Constantine to put a stop to the progress of the heresy of Arius. [If this speech is genuine, we can no longer doubt that it does not belong to Eusebius of Cæsarea.] These words, *Qui Arius nescio quomodo allectus in presbyteratum nos latuit*, [agree better with S. Alexander than S. Eustathius. But there is some cause to doubt the genuineness of this piece, since Theodorit does not mention S. Eustathius's having said any thing against Arius; which yet was not to be forgot. The very clear and express confession of the divinity and consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost may also appear somewhat suspicious.] But these terms *una divinitas in tribus personis & hypostasibus*, [are yet more so,] ξ if what Socrates says be true, that the Council would not enter into the discussion of the word hypostasis.

NOTE VII. referr'd to in §. 7. p. 616.

Upon the discourse ascrib'd to Constantine by Gelasius Cyzicenus.

[GElasius Cyzicenus puts into Constantine's mouth a speech very different from that in Eusebius and much longer, at the close of which he inserts what Theodorit ascribes to him, and which he might say some time afterwards whilst they sat, rather than in his first discourse. But he sufficiently shews, that himself was the author of this harangue, and not Constantine,] ο for he says in the introduction, that Constantine *spoke somewhat after this manner*; π and at the close, that he *spoke these words, and others of the same nature*.

NOTE VIII. referr'd to in §. 10. p. 627.

The pretended act of the subscription of Eusebius and Theognis.

ρ WE have also, according to Socrates, the pretended act in which Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis submit to subscribe the Consubstantiality. They say there, that they are very

ν *Sur.* 10. *jul.* p. 159, 160. ξ *Socr. l.* 3. *c.* 7. *p.* 175. *c.* ο *Gel. C. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 70. π *p.* 85. ρ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.* 23. *c.* | *c.* 14. *p.* 43, 44.

ready

ready to ſuffer without oppoſition the ſentence the Council had pronounc'd againſt them; but that the fear of confirming the calumnies objected by their adverſaries, if they continued ſilent, obliges them to declare that they had agreed to the definition of the faith, and even to the word *Conſubſtantial*, the ſenſe of which they now underſtood better; that they had never pretended to hinder peace, as they had never follow'd hereſy; that they had only ſaid what they thought neceſſary, from no other motive but the deſire of contributing to the Church's ſecurity; and that after this declaration of their opinion they had made no difficulty to ſubſcribe to the faith; that they had not ſign'd the Anathema of Arius, becauſe his letters and his private diſcourſes convinc'd them, that he did not maintain the opinions imputed to him; that if the Council would favour them ſo far as to receive them, they were ready to aſſure them, as they had already done in their petition, that they would not oppoſe what had been decreed, but would conſent to it, which they did, not to avoid baniſhment but the ſuſpicion of hereſy: That if they will allow them to appear in the Council, they are ready to embrace all its deciſions with a perfect conſent; that they hope to obtain this favour from the Council, ſince with ſo much good nature and gentleneſs they had call'd back and receiv'd him who was accuſed of theſe errors; and that ſince the perſon himſelf who ſeem'd to be the offender, had been recall'd, and had juſtified himſelf upon the points of which he had been accus'd, it would be very ſtrange to make them paſs for convicts, for want of defending their own innocence; that they withal beſought the Council to intercede for them with the Emperor, and to pronounce without delay what they judg'd proper concerning their affair.

σ This, ſays Socrates, was the recantation of Euſebius and Theognis, τ and it is likewiſe related by Sozomen. [υ There ſeems but little grounds for charging a piece with forgery that is mention'd by two very ancient hiſtorians, and from which we do not find that either the Catholicks or Arians could draw any great advantage.] Φ Yet this has been done in a tract publiſh'd in 1665, and ſuch ſtrong reaſons have been given for it, [that tho' we have endeavour'd ſeveral times to find ſome anſwer to them, we have never been able to meet with any that is ſatisfactory.

We can date this action but, either when the Council of Nice was yet ſitting, or when Euſebius and Theognis were recall'd from exile, that is in 328 according to Philoſtorgius.] χ Valeſius follows this laſt opinion, upon the authority of Sozomen, ↓ which obliges him to ſay, that Arius was recall'd from exile before theſe Biſhops: [And he muſt neceſſarily ſay ſo, who follows this interpretation. Yet this is a matter not eaſily to be maintain'd. For according to Rufinus, who is follow'd by

σ *p.* 44. *c.* τ *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 16. *p.* 464, 465. υ *Ath. vit. B. p.* 13. 2. *e.* Φ *Apo. de P. R.* 4. *p.* 32 --- 50. χ *Socr. n. p.* 10, 11. ↓ *p.* 10. 2. *d.*

the other hiſtorians,] ω Arius was not recall'd till ſome time after the death of Conſtantia; [and Conſtantia did not die till after S. Helen. Now we ſee no ground for ſaying that S. Helen died before the year 328. This however is no unanſwerable difficulty; the authority of Rufinus not being ſo great, as to cauſe us to reject an act which otherwiſe appears authentick. But it is not eaſy to aſcertain, why in 328 Euſebius and Theognis ſhould talk of the conſent they gave to the definition of the Council of Nice concerning the faith; becauſe it was three years ſince that had paſs'd, and it bore no relation to their exile.

But what appears to us yet leſs capable of an anſwer, is that they ſay they did not anathematize Arius.] α For Theodorit expreſly ſays, that they anathematiz'd him, and that before any body elſe. [And indeed I do not ſee how the Council could exempt them from joining in that anathema, Arius having himſelf own'd his hereſy in full Council, beſides the indiſputable proofs of it, which were to be ſeen in his writings. Euſebius could have been leſs diſpens'd with than any other, who had himſelf been convicted of as many errors as even Arius himſelf. It is yet harder for me to conceive, how at the ſame time that they ſay Arius had juſtified himſelf and been receiv'd to favour, they could offer to anathematize him. For this is the meaning which their words naturally bear; and if this is not what they offer, what do they offer to merit their being recall'd, which they had not already done before they were baniſh'd? It is withal very difficult not to believe according to the terms of this petition, that Arius had juſtified himſelf in a ſolemn manner before the Biſhops, and had conſequently been receiv'd into the communion of the Church. Now this we know did not happen till 335 in the Council of Jeruſalem, a long time after Euſebius and Theognis had been recall'd from exile.

If any body will ſay, with Socrates, that the retractation of Euſebius was made while the Council ſat, the moſt plauſible thing that can be ſaid to defend it, is, that Euſebius and Theognis having been condemn'd to baniſhment, becauſe they would not ſign the Creed of the Council and the anathema of Arius; to avoid baniſhment they drew up this act by which they ſubſcribe the Creed, and declare they are ready alſo to ſign the anathema of Arius, if the Council judges it convenient. To this it muſt be added, in order to explain what they ſay of Arius, that this Arch-heretick after he was anathematiz'd, ſubmitted in appearance to the authority of the Council, and ſubſcrib'd the Creed, as S. Jerom has maintain'd; which was the reaſon why the order to ſend them into baniſhment was repeal'd: and that things were in this condition when Euſebius and Theognis drew up their act: But that afterwards Arius returning to his vomit, and his hypocriſy being diſcover'd, he was anathematiz'd afreſh by the Euſebians themſelves, and by the reſt, and baniſh'd into Illyricum. For it is certain that he departed no otherwiſe from the Council.

ω *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *p.* 242. α *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *p.* 542. *c.*

It

It is a very difficult matter to believe this change of Arius, which the original authors have taken no notice of. We ſhall ſee elſewhere what anſwer is to be given to S. Jerom upon this point. But our preſent buſineſs is to ſee, whether even ſuppoſing all this, the petition can be defended.

1ſt, I queſtion whether it can eaſily be believ'd, that Euſebius and Theognis durſt reproach the Council of Nice with having condemn'd them without a hearing, πρὸ κρίσεως: They were not in a condition to talk after that manner, which may be call'd an inſolence. 2dly, But it is yet more difficult to be perſuaded, that they had the impudence to ſay before the Council, that they had not believ'd or that they did not yet believe, that Arius maintain'd the opinions imputed to him, after the proofs they had ſeen of it, and even after Euſebius himſelf had been convicted of holding the ſame hereſies. This would have been to draw upon themſelves the indignation, not the mercy of the Council. 3dly, It is no leſs difficult in this opinion than the other, to believe that he offer'd to anathematize Arius, when even Arius having juſtified himſelf, could no more be anathematiz'd by any body; tho' in this caſe it is more eaſy to ſay, that it is a confirmation of the promiſe they had made to ſubmit to the Council. 4thly, I queſtion alſo whether the term of recalling is very proper for the diſannulling a ſentence of baniſhment not yet executed. 5thly, We muſt add to this, that neither S. Euſtathius, nor the Council of Alexandria in 339, nor S. Athanaſius, nor any other original author has obſerv'd that Euſebius was condemn'd by the Council of Nice; which would have been no ſmall advantage to the Church: They are pleas'd only to ſay, that he complied out of fear of baniſhment.] β S. Jerom, who had occaſion to juſtify the indulgence of the Church towards ſome Biſhops, ſpeaks of that of the Council of Nice, [but he does not ſay that it extended to Biſhops already condemn'd. Thus we may be aſſur'd that he was not acquainted with this piece. Theſe things may be ſeen more at large, and ſet in a clearer light in the tract we have mention'd, *p.* 38-45. They are likewiſe in the annotations upon the life of S. Athanaſius, the tenth chapter of the ſecond book, *p.* 818, 819. And Father Alexander follows them both, *t.* 8. *p.* 185 -- 196.]

NOTE IX. referr'd to in §. 11. p. 629.

That Arius did not ſubſcribe the Conſubſtantiality.

γ S. Jerom aſſerts, that Arius was receiv'd into the Church by the Council of Nice, and that he there ſubſcrib'd the Conſubſtantiality with Saras a Prieſt of Lybia, Euzoïus, and

Hier. in Lucif. p. 144. *c.*

γ *Hier. in Lucif. c.* 7. *p.* 144. *c.*

Achillas a Reader [or rather Prieſt;] and this Father ſays, that this is prov'd from the ſubſcriptions of the Council. [As it is certain that if Arius ſubſcrib'd, it was out of nothing but hypocriſy, it may be that his prevarication having been ſoon diſcern'd by the Council itſelf, he was anathematiz'd anew, and thus entirely loſt the benefit he hop'd to gain by his ſubſcription. For we have many proofs to ſhew, that he continued under the anathema of the Council; but this fickleneſs of Arius has no witneſs, without which we dare not advance a fact of that importance. Nor has it even any probability; neither S. Athanaſius nor any other having drawn any advantage from it in favour of the truth, nor obſerv'd that Arianiſm was anathematiz'd by Arius himſelf.

As to what we have ſaid, that it cannot be doubted, but Arius remain'd under the Council's anathema,] δ the proofs of it may be ſeen in the Apology of the Religious of Port-Royal quoted in the foregoing Note, in the life of S. Athanaſius, and in Father Alexander. [For it is not neceſſary to repeat them here again. It ſuffices even to conſider after what manner] ε the Fathers of Nice ſpeak to the Churches of Egypt in the letter they wrote to them to acquaint them with the reſult of this affair. [Thus we muſt either abſolutely give up S. Jerom, or ſay that he has confounded Arius the arch-heretick with one of his diſciples of the ſame name, and who was alſo Prieſt of Alexandria as well as he.

It appears alſo, that the ſentence of baniſhment to which the arch-heretick was condemn'd, was executed.] ζ For Philoſtorgius ſays abſolutely that he was baniſh'd with his Prieſts into Illyricum: η Rufinus ſays in like manner that he was ſent into baniſhment, θ and he adds that he was not recall'd till a long time afterwards, when Conſtantia was dead. ι Socrates who believ'd, tho' without aſſerting it, that he was really recall'd during the ſitting of the Council, ſays that nevertheleſs they forbad him to go to Alexandria. κ He is follow'd by Sozomen. λ But tho' he ſometimes ſpeaks poſitively of it, μ yet he owns in another place, that it is but a bare conjecture founded upon the ſequel of the hiſtory. [So that we ſhall have no cauſe to mind it much, if we find that the ſequel itſelf does not favour it.]

δ *Apo. de* P. R. 4. *p.* 46, 49. | *Ath. vie, p.* 820, 821. | *Alex. t.* 8. *p.* 197 — 203. ε *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 9. *p.* 27, 28. ζ *Phiſg. app. p.* 177. η *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *p.* 238. θ *c.* 11. *p.* 242. ι *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 14. *p.* 44. *c.* κ *Soz. l.* 1. *c.* 21. *p.* 435. *c.* λ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.* 23. *c.* μ *c.* 14. *p.* 44. *c.*

NOTE

NOTE X. referr'd to in §. 11. p. 630.

That Secundus of Ptolemaïs was anathematiz'd by the Council with Arius.

[NOtwithſtanding all the authorities we have produc'd to ſhew that Secundus of Ptolemaïs in Libya and Theonas of Marmarica were anathematiz'd by the Council with Arius,] ν Baronius pretends that Secundus at laſt ſubmitted to the authority of the Council, and was receiv'd with the reſt. But what he ſays is grounded only upon this, that the name of Secundus is found in the ſubſcriptions, [which we know are of little authority.] ξ This very Secundus is there called Biſhop of Tanis or Taucinum, [and not of Ptolemaïs. It is evidently] ο he of Teuchira in Libya, whom Philoſtorgius affirms to have favour'd Arius in the Council.

NOTE XI. referr'd to in §. 11. p. 631.

That the Creed, entitled, Againſt Paul of Samoſata, was not that of the Council of Nice, nor that of Antioch.

π WE have in the acts of the Council of Epheſus a definition in form of a Creed, drawn up againſt Paul of Samoſata, ρ which Baronius aſcribes to the Council of Antioch, which condemn'd that Biſhop; σ to which he adds, that it was from this piece that it was ſaid the Council had rejected the term *Conſubſtantial*. [But the title of this Creed in the Council of Epheſus expreſly attributes it to the Council of Nice. And ſo far are we from being able to reject the Conſubſtantiality upon account of this Creed, that there is nothing on the other hand which eſtabliſhes it ſo clearly and ſtrongly. It is made to explain the two natures of Jeſus Chriſt in one only perſon. Wherefore it ſays, that he is very God, even with his body, tho' not according to his body; that he is perfect man, with his divinity, but not according to his divinity. It ſays in like manner, that he is to be ador'd and that he adores; that he is made and not made; and in ſhort, that he is perfectly conſubſtantial with God, even with his body, but not according to his body; that he is likewiſe conſubſtantial with us, according to the fleſh with his divinity,

ν *Bar.* 325. §. 76, 77. ξ *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 51. *b.* ο *Phiſg. app. p.* 177. π *Conc. B. t.* 2. *p.* 524. ρ *Bar.* 272. §. 15. σ §. 17.

but not according to his divinity. It explains afterwards more at large this point of the Conſubſtantiality. We cannot therefore ſay in any reſpect, that it was made by the Council of Antioch. But I would not on the other hand affirm, from a bare title, that it belong'd to the Council of Nice. For to make a judgment of it from the piece itſelf, it appears rather to have been made by ſome After-Council againſt Neſtorius and Eutyches. And certainly ſo expreſs as it is againſt theſe two hereſies, it would often have been quoted if it had been the Nicene Council's. And yet I do not think that it ever has been quoted; and that which has always been made uſe of, is the ordinary Nicene Creed, which is much leſs expreſs.] τ Mr. Du Pin is of opinion, that it was compil'd by ſome Biſhops to reconcile the definitions of the Councils of Antioch and Nice, and to explain in what ſenſe the term Conſubſtantial was rejected by the former and approv'd by the latter. [However, the ſenſe in which this Creed rejects it, has no relation to what is ſaid of the ' Council of Antioch.]

τ See Paul of Samoſata, §. 5.

NOTE XII. referr'd to in §. 12. p. 632.

That the Melitians were to be receiv'd by impoſition of hands, not by re-ordination.

υ THE obſervation we made, that the Melitians were to be confirm'd in the Church by the moſt ſacred ceremonies, is expreſs'd in the original text of the Council of Nice by the word χειροτονία, [which ordinarily ſignifies Election or Ordination. There is no diſpute here concerning Election; and if it is taken for ordination, this ſeems contrary to the doctrine of the Church, which does not allow a new ordination of thoſe who have been already ordain'd. But χειροτονία ſignifies ordination only becauſe the hands were ſtretch'd out to denote thoſe who were elected, and afterwards to be laid upon their head. So that it may ſignify every ſort of impoſition of hands; and it is not at all ſtrange, that the Council ſhould order impoſition of hands upon thoſe who return'd from the ſchiſm, not to ordain them anew, but to ſanctify by this benediction the ordination they had already receiv'd, to the end they might lawfully and holily perform in the Church what they could not do in ſchiſm but by an unlawful and ſacrilegious uſurpation. The very word *confirm*, made uſe of by the Council, ſhews that they did not look upon the ordination receiv'd in ſchiſm as null.]

This point has been treated more at large in the ſecond edition of the life of S. Athanaſius *t.* 1. *p.* 821 --- 824; Φ And Valeſius, who pretends that re-ordination was not always rejected by the Church, found nothing to urge againſt this but the exam-

τ *Du Pin, t.* 1. *p.* 585, 586. *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.* 547. *b.*
Φ *Thdrt. n. p.* 11.

ple

ple of Theodorus of Oxyrinchus, who, as Marcellinus a Luciferian Prieſt ſays, re-ordain'd ſome Melitian Prieſts and Deacons. [It is not very ſecure to rely upon what a ſchiſmatick urges againſt the enemies of his ſect. But be it as it will, this Theodorus had himſelf been re-ordain'd by the Arians according to the ſame Marcellinus, and Valeſius will not doubt but in this he tranſgreſs'd the law of the Church: So that it muſt not be wonder'd at, if he again tranſgreſs'd it with regard to the Melitians. Valeſius could ſee in the paſſage he oppoſes, *p.* 822. that Euſtathius of Sebaſtia re-ordain'd ſome perſons: but he might have ſeen there alſo the judgment which S. Baſil paſs'd upon that action.]

NOTE XIII. referr'd to in §. 12. p. 632.

That the Melitian Clergy took place only from the day of their being reunited to the Church.

χ THE Council of Nice decrees, that the Melitian Clergy who ſhould return to the Church, ſhould take place only after the old Catholicks who were ordain'd before, τοῖς προχειροτονημένοις. If they underſtand by this thoſe who had been ordain'd before the Melitians, this would be to impoſe no puniſhment upon them, but to rank them in the common order which plac'd the Clergy according to the time of their promotion; and the Council had no need to make any decree concerning this, or it ought to expreſs it not as a puniſhment, but as a favour which they granted them. [So that the προχειροτονημένοι muſt be thoſe who had been ordain'd before that time, and before the re-union of the Melitians.]

NOTE XIV. referr'd to in §. 13. p. 636.

Upon the ſubject of S. Chryſoſtom's homily, entitled, Againſt thoſe who faſt upon the firſt Eaſter.

[WE find it very hard to underſtand what is the true ſubject of S. Chryſoſtom's homily, entitled, *Againſt thoſe who faſt upon the firſt Eaſter.* This expreſſion is not only in the title,] ↓ but in the diſcourſe itſelf of the Saint, [and hence ariſes the difficulty. He evidently ſpeaks againſt ſome Chriſtians, who following the ancient practice of the Churches of Syria, obſerv'd

χ *Theodrt. l.* 4. *c.* 8. *p.* 547. *b.*

↓ *Chry. t.* 5. *or.* 55. *p.* 608. *c.*

Eaſter at the time the Jews celebrated their feaſt of unleaven'd bread, which oblig'd them to be abſent from the eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies at the time of the Paſſion and Reſurrection, that is, on the moſt ſolemn days. However they did not abſolutely follow the Jews, but ſtay'd to celebrate the Reſurrection the Sunday after the 14th day of the moon. Thus they differ'd from the Church only in this, that they follow'd the calculation of the Jews to find the firſt moon when Eaſter was to be obſerv'd.

If the calculation of the Jews was ordinarily later than that of the Church, I ſhould ſee no difficulty in ſaying that they faſted upon the firſt Eaſter, that is, that they ſtill continued the Lent-faſt, when the Church had already rejoic'd for the Reſurrection in the years that the Church obſerv'd Eaſter before the Jews. But I think the quite contrary is uſually ſuppos'd, and that the calculation of the Jews was earlier than that of the Church, ſo that they ſometimes obſerv'd Eaſter before the equinox.] ω Theodorit ſpeaking of an hermit nam'd Abraham, who was evidently in the ſame caſe with thoſe againſt whom S. Chryſoſtom ſpeaks, expreſſes himſelf very differently, and ſays that he obſerv'd the firſt day of Eaſter. [Nevertheleſs I am of opinion, that the calculation of the Jews, which was ordinarily before that of the Church, was likewiſe ſometimes later, and that this fell out in the year S. Chryſoſtom made the homily we are ſpeaking of, tho' this ſeems to us very difficult to reconcile with the hiſtory of this [1] Saint. We wiſh ſome perſon more underſtanding than we had examin'd this point; but as for us, we can find out no other ſolution. But if this is the true ſenſe of S. Chryſoſtom, we muſt explain of the firſt days in Lent] α what this Saint ſays, that thoſe againſt whom he ſpeaks, ſtay'd at home getting themſelves drunk, whilſt the Clergy and all the people were faſting and praying.

[1] See his title, Note 25.

[We ſaid, that theſe people always celebrated Eaſter upon Sunday, as the Church did,] β becauſe when S. Chryſoſtom had a mind to ſhew them, that by following the calculation of the Jews, if it were as exact as it was the contrary, they could not however celebrate the Paſſion and Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, upon the real days on which they happen'd; (for this ſeems to be one of the reaſons they alledg'd;) he repreſents to them, that Jeſus Chriſt was crucified upon the firſt day of unleaven'd bread and upon a friday, which cannot always meet together. He proves it by that ſame year, in which the firſt day of unleaven'd bread was to be a Sunday; and inſtead of ſaying that this oblig'd them to celebrate the Paſſion upon Sunday, and the Reſurrection upon Tueſday tho' it happen'd upon a Sunday, he ſays theſe words: "So that we muſt faſt all the week, and con-"tinue to faſt both after the day of the Paſſion, and after that "of the Reſurrection; and this is what happens every time the "week is not finiſh'd." [Tho' he ſays *we muſt faſt*, and not

ω *Thdrt. v. Pat. c. 3. p. 792. b.* α *Chry. t. 5. or. 55. p. 629. b, c.* β *p. 617. a, b.*

you

you must fast, yet it is plain his reasoning proves nothing, if that observation was not common to those whom he pretended to refute.] γ For which reason he repeats at the end of his discourse, that he had shew'd before, that neither they, nor the Catholicks, nor any body else could observe the real day of the Passion and Resurrection: ἐπιλαβέσθαι τῆς κυρίας ἡμέρας. [For so we must certainly read it, and not κυριακῆς.

This observation makes us afraid, that in the history of Pope Victor we have not sufficiently explain'd what relates to the dispute about Easter between this Pope and the Asiaticks, and afterwards between the Churches of Syria and the others. For we have always suppos'd, that the difficulty was to know, whether they were to keep exactly to the fourteenth day of the moon, or stay till the Sunday following to celebrate the Resurrection: And it seems by what we just now said, that the dispute between the Churches of Syria and the others did not relate to Sunday, but what was the 14th day of the moon which was to settle Easter. We have however follow'd, as much as possible, the terms of the authors. And if we have not taken the right sense of them, those who find it out will do us a great pleasure in correcting us.]

NOTE XV. referr'd to in §. 13. p. 637.

Whether the cycle of nineteen years was made by order of the Council.

δ BUcherius in the work he wrote upon the paschal cycle of Victorius, says he can hardly believe that the Council of Nice determin'd any thing upon the cycle of 19 years; and he is much more inclin'd to say, that Eusebius of Cæsarea having publish'd it about the time of the Council, that gave ground to believe it was made by their authority. ε He founds his opinion chiefly upon the opposition which several Latins have made to that supputation, which would not have been, says he, if it had come from the Council of Nice, whose authority was particularly rever'd by the Latins; ζ and upon this, that even among the Greeks, there had always been a great many disputes about the feast of Easter, till Theophilus of Alexandria settled it for an hundred years. [It is not difficult to answer these reasons, since whether the Council establish'd the Golden number or not, it is plain by S. Ambrose, Gennadius, and Dionysius Exiguus, that in the West it was believ'd they did. The belief of this point, whether true or false, must produce the same effects, and oblige them to follow this calculation, or give their reasons why they did not. And as for the East, since Bucherius agrees that the Golden number was follow'd there, we cannot con-

γ *p.* 629. *c.* δ *Buch. cycl. p.* 127, 129. ε *p.* 128. ζ *p.* 129.

clude

clude from thence that the Council of Nice did not eſtabliſh it.]

η What he ſays of an old calendar, where the golden number is not ſet down, is yet more weak, ſince it is not neceſſary it ſhould be every where.

θ He pretends, that S. Ambroſe, after having ſaid poſitively that the cycle of nineteen years came from the Council, obſerves afterwards that this was not to be met with in expreſs terms, but only by conſequence; becauſe he ſays, ι *Unde Majores noſtri in tractatu Concilii Nicæni eum diem Enneadecaeteride, ſi quis diligenter intendat, ſtatuendum putarunt.* But what follows in S. Ambroſe, gives ground to believe that theſe words, *ſi quis diligenter intendat*, do not fall upon *eum diem*, &c. but upon the *Unde* which is at the beginning of this paſſage; and that it ſignifies, that if any one takes good notice of it, they will find that the Council took the cycle of nineteen years from the Egyptians. And indeed Bucherius himſelf owns, that this cycle was firſt found out, tho' very imperfectly, about the end of the ſecond century by S. Anatolius of Laodicea, who was of Alexandria and had liv'd there a long time.

κ Dionyſius Exiguus aſſures us, that the Council of Nice decreed likewiſe, that the moon in which Eaſter was to be obſerv'd, was that which began between the eighth of March and the fifth of April; that the 14th of that ſame moon muſt fall between the 21ſt of March and the 18th of April; and that if this 14th of the moon ſhould happen upon the 21ſt of March upon a Saturday, the feaſt of Eaſter ſhould be obſerv'd the next day. λ Bucherius does not think, that all this was order'd by the Council, foraſmuch as all theſe things have been often diſputed, and except Dionyſius Exiguus no body ever ſaid that this was ſettled by the Council of Nice. μ Dionyſius alledges the ſeventh book of the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. [I do not know what hiſtory he can mean.]

η *p.* 434. 1, 2. θ *p.* 128. 1, 2. ι *Amb. de Paſ.* t. 4. *p.* 306. 1. κ *Buch. p.* 487. λ *p.* 94--96. μ *p.* 487.

NOTE

NOTE XVI. referr'd to in §. 14. p. 642.

Whether the Biſhop of Jeruſalem was independent.

[THO' the Biſhop of Jeruſalem is generally nam'd before that of Cæſarea,] ν yet S. Dionyſius of Alexandria names Theoctiſtus of Cæſarea before Mazabanus of Jeruſalem. ξ He was not Biſhop till after Theoctiſtus. [I do not know whether it was for that reaſon.]

ο To know whether the Biſhop of Jeruſalem was αὐτοκέφαλος and independent, which Blondel thinks may be ſupported by many authorities, or whether notwithſtanding his rank, ſuperior to that of the Biſhop of Cæſarea, he was not ſtill with regard to juriſdiction ſubject to him as his Metropolitan, which Baronius and Cardinal Perron have maintain'd, is a thing not eaſy to decide. [It is certainly ſomewhat improper, that a Biſhop ſuperior as to rank ſhould be inferior as to juriſdiction. It is plain by the diſputes between S. Cyril of Jeruſalem and Acacius of Cæſarea, that the former did not acknowledge himſelf at all dependent on the other.] π What S. Jerom ſays, that John of Jeruſalem ſhould addreſs himſelf to the Biſhop of Cæſarea who was the Metropolitan of Paleſtine, and not to the Biſhop of Alexandria, [ſounds ſtrong for Cæſarea. And yet S. Jerom might have a particular reaſon for ſpeaking thus, ſince the diſpute was to be determin'd by thoſe Biſhops, who were neareſt the place; beſides that the queſtion being likewiſe about the bounds of the dioceſe of Jeruſalem, it related more particularly to the Metropolitan.] ρ He ſays afterwards, that John had avoided paying the honour that he ow'd to his Metropolitan. [It is difficult to judge whether he means Cæſarea or Antioch. And whatever may be made of this paſſage, S. Jerom is too warm in it, and writes here with too much of the ſpirit of a party-man, to let this place be conſider'd as a teſtimony. Being angry with John, he makes uſe of every thing he can to check him, and ſupports all the pretenſions that could be made againſt him.

The preſidence which the Biſhops of Cæſarea had in their Councils over thoſe of Jeruſalem, is a deciſive proof if the latter went to them as being oblig'd to it; but it has much leſs ſtrength in it, if they went thither of their own accord.

σ We muſt be more particular in conſidering the hiſtory of S. Porphyry, in which it is ſaid that John of Cæſarea deſir'd Praylius (or rather John) Biſhop of Jeruſalem, to ſend him that Saint who was then Prieſt of Jeruſalem, to explain to him ſome

ν *Euſ. l. 7. c. 5. p. 251. d.* ξ *d.* | *l. 6. c. 46. p. 248. a.*
ο *Blond. prim. p. 544.* | *Bar. 325. §. 139.* [π *Hier. ep. 61. t. 2. p. 178. d.* ρ *p. 179. c.* σ *Boll. 26. feb. p. 647. §. 11, 12.*

difficul-

difficulty in Scripture, and that when he was at Cæsarea, he ordain'd him Bishop of Gaza. τ Baronius infers from hence, that the Bishop of Jerusalem was subject to that of Cæsarea, since the latter had a right to take his Priests. [And yet Metropolitans had not this right over their suffragans, according to the Canons. The Bishops of Africa made a Canon on purpose to give this privilege to the Bishop of Carthage, and then he was oblig'd to make one demand of the Ecclesiastick whom he wanted. So that we may say this story proves too much: but I do not know whether it would be true to say it proves nothing.] υ Blondel absolutely rejects the life of S. Porphyry upon the account of the difficulties which are in it. [These difficulties are certainly great: and yet as on the other hand this life has a great appearance of truth, we have not been able hitherto to bring ourselves to give it up.]

Φ Blondel collects together a great many things for the authority and independence of the Bishop of Jerusalem. [But all that he brings, adds nothing to what we said above of the impropriety there seems to be in a Bishop's being subject to the jurisdiction of him to whom he is superior as to rank.] χ He even pretends to give him jurisdiction over the neighbouring Churches as early as the fourth century, or rather from the beginning of the third; [which cannot be maintain'd, it being expressly contrary to the Nicene Canon.]

ψ Lupus reduces all the honour granted to the Bishop of Jerusalem to his being the first suffragan of Cæsarea. [But if he had no more than this, the Council had no occasion to take any precautions for preserving the dignity of the Metropolitan. And besides, the whole history gives us a quite different notion of it.]

NOTE XVII. referr'd to in §. 15. p. 643.

That the Viaticum in the XIII *Canon of Nice means the Eucharist.*

ω ALbaspinæus thinks, that the Viaticum mention'd in the thirteenth Canon of Nice, is not the Eucharist, but only absolution, which he grounds upon the conclusion of this Canon, which orders the Eucharist not to be given to dying persons without examination. [This would infer, that absolution must be given to all dying people without examining their dispositions. It is very true to say, that at present the order is to grant the Eucharist to all dying persons who desire it: yet this is not done without some sort of examination. And it was not at all

τ *Bar.* 325. §. 138, 139. υ *Blond. prim. p.* 552. Φ *p.* 544--547. χ *p.* 545, 547. ψ *Lup. in can. t.* 1. *p* 43. ω *Conc. c. t.* 2. *p.* 80--82.

strange

ſtrange for the Council to refer the communion of dying perſons to the judgment of the Biſhop, that is, as far as the neceſſity of the ſick perſon could allow it, ſince nothing was done then in the Church, eſpecially with relation to penance, but with the conſent of the Biſhop and by his order. But the Canon ſays only that the Biſhop ſhall give the Euchariſt, becauſe the Biſhops at that time did not excuſe themſelves from performing that function, and yet leſs from abſolving penitents. It is the ſame thing as if we ſhould ſay now: Let the Pariſh-Prieſt give it; which would not at all hinder the Vicar or any other Prieſt from giving it, when the Pariſh-Prieſt was not to be had. And there are but few perſons to be met with who will ſay, that abſolution was ever given to ſick people, without examining in what manner they deſire it. That is a ſacrament as well as the Euchariſt, and we are forbidden to profane the one as well as the other. It would be much more eaſy to juſtify their having requir'd not much leſs preparation for abſolution than for the Euchariſt. But if the Council granted only abſolution to dying people, why does it add, that] if they recover their health, thoſe who are under penance ſhall continue only in the communion of prayers? [If the Euchariſt had not been allow'd them at the point of death, they would never pretend to it when they were in health, and in a condition to perform their penance. And therefore it was a very uſeleſs precaution to exclude them from it.]

NOTE XVIII. referr'd to in §. 15. p. 645.

The ſenſe of the addition to the XIX *Canon of Nice, which relates to Deaconeſſes.*

[THE addition relating to Deaconeſſes, which is at the end of the nineteenth Canon of Nice, may ſignify that the Council mention'd them among the Clergy, and ſaid that they might be depos'd, only becauſe they were in the rank and condition of Church-officers, tho' they had no ſhare in the prieſthood, and were no part of the Clergy, ſince they did not receive impoſition of hands, and therefore were entirely in the rank of laicks. It ſeems, this was Baronius's opinion, *an.* 34. §. 283. But he falls into this inconveniency, that by the ſame reaſon all the inferior Clergy, even the Subdeacons, will be only laicks.]

[a] Albaſpinæus thinks, that this Canon takes notice of two ſorts of Deaconeſſes among the Paulianiſts, one of which having receiv'd impoſition of hands, ſhould be reſtor'd according to their rank, if they were judg'd worthy of it, after having receiv'd the baptiſm of the Church; and the others having in-

[a] *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 83.

truded

truded into the function of Deaconesses against the forms, and without having receiv'd imposition of hands, should absolutely remain in the rank of laïcks. [This sense would be very favourable, if in the Canon there was χειροθεσίαν τινὲς, instead of χειροθεσίαν τινά; and if it could be found, (what in all likelihood is not true,) that hands were impos'd upon Deaconesses.]

NOTE XIX. referr'd to in §. 16. p. 648.

Several orders ascrib'd to the Council of Nice.

[BEsides the things we have taken notice of in the text, which are cited from the Council of Nice, and which are not to be met with in the copies we have of that synod, there are several others mention'd, with which we did not think ourselves oblig'd to disturb the course of the history.]

β Pope Innocent I. in his 23d epistle, chapter the 6th, seems to say, that the Council of Nice excluded those from the Ecclesiastick state, who after their baptism had been in the wars, or had pleaded at the bar, and several other orders of the like nature. γ Lupus says indeed that he cites the 10th and 12th Canons of Nice. [He should rather have said the 9th and 10th, which lay down rules for ordination, but not those which Innocent mentions. So that it is better to say this is an explanation added to these Canons: and even the text of Innocent seems to signify as much.]

δ The same Pope says, that causes of importance should be brought before the holy See, as the synod had order'd; and a little before he had cited that of Nice. ε It is thought that he means the fourth Canon of the Council of Sardica, which he and S. Leo are wont to confound with that of Nice. ζ We must perhaps answer in the same manner to S. Leo, who demanding a General Council in Italy to reform the *conciliabulum* of Ephesus, says that the Nicene Canons shew that it cannot be refus'd, since S. Flavian had appeal'd.

η Father Lupus objects, that the Council of Carthage says that That of Nice forbad the offering of the sacrifice after dinner; θ and he answers, that this Council of Carthage cites for it one of the same city, and not that of Nice. ι He objects in the same manner κ that the twenty fourth Canon of the second Council of Arles cites the great Synod, which orders that calumniators shall not be receiv'd to communion but at their death; λ and after-

β *Conc. t.* 2. *p.* 1282. *a.* γ *Lup. in can. t.* 1. *p.* 115.
δ *Conc. p.* 1250. *d.* ε *Lup. p.* 114. ζ *Leo. ep.* 40. *c.* 3. *p.* 511. η *Lup. p.* 112. θ *p.* 115. ι *p.* 112.
κ *Conc. t.* 4. *p.* 104. *a.* λ *Lup. p.* 115.

wards

wards he anſwers that this great Synod is the firſt of Arles. He cites likewiſe Theodorit (or rather Theodorus) Deacon of Alexandria, who complaining of Dioſcorus's having excommunicated S. Leo, ſays that in that he had violated the Council of Nice. μ But what Theodorus ſays, is that he had done it at Nice.

ν When Placidia the Empreſs wrote to Theodoſius II, that the Pope's legates were wont to be preſent at Councils, according to the deciſions of that of Nice, [thoſe deciſions are nothing in all likelihood but what was done at this Council, the example of which ſerv'd for a rule for what was to be done at others.]

ξ G. Gregory of Tours cites a Canon of Nice, which pronounces an anathema againſt thoſe wives who ſhould leave their husbands, pretending that people cannot be ſav'd in a married ſtate. ο Father Lupus ſays, that this is a Canon of the Council of Gangra, which might perhaps be join'd to that of Nice without any diſtinction.

π The Council of Narbon in 589 cites from the Council of Nice, that Eccleſiaſticks were forbidden to make leagues and parties together. ρ It is pretended, that it cites the Council of Nice for that of Chalcedon. We may ſee in Lupus ſome other ſuch-like paſſages taken from more modern authors.

NOTE XX. referr'd to in §. 17. p. 649.

Upon the hiſtory of S. Paphnutius concerning celibacy.

σ BAronius pretends, that what Socrates and Sozomen ſay of the hiſtory of S. Paphnutius concerning celibacy, is a falſe ſtory, becauſe it is contrary to the diſcipline of that time, which oblig'd, ſays he, all the Clergy to continence. [This indeed is a point which requires a long diſcuſſion, and which we do not pretend to treat of here. But it is difficult to think, that all that can be ſaid againſt this ſtory, ſhould not appear incomparably more ſtrong in Socrates's time than in ours: And even conſidering the manner τ of Socrates's ſpeaking, it is not eaſy to believe that he knew of any expreſs law at Conſtantinople that oblig'd the Clergy to continence.] υ Neither Baronius's reaſon nor his authority have hindred Father Lupus from receiving this piece of hiſtory as true.

μ *Conc. t. 4. p. 398. b.* ν *p. 54. d.* ξ *Gr. T. h. Fr. l. 9. c. 33. p. 501.* ο *Lup. p. 115* π *Conc. t. 5. p. 1019. b.* ρ *b. | Lup. p. 115.* σ *Bar. 58. §. 21. | 325. §. 150.* τ *Socr. l. 1. c. 11. p. 39. d.* υ *Lup. in can. p. 114.*

φ Valesius says however, that it appears to him to be suspicious; [and it is certain that Socrates and Sozomen were capable of believing and writing some things, which had little or no foundation. But as for the reasons which Valesius alledges, I do not see that they have much strength in them. For Rufinus might not know or might omit a great many things which were very true :] χ And tho' Valesius says, that no body places Paphnutius among the Bishops of Egypt who assisted at the Council of Nice, ↓ Rufinus expressly puts him among them, and that with very great commendations.

NOTE XXI. referr'd to in §. 17. p. 650.

That S. Basil did not know of the VIII *Canon of Nice.*

α WE find in S. Basil the execution of the eighth Canon of Nice; [and yet it seems as if that Saint was not acquainted with this same Canon. For the Canon supposes the baptism of the Novatians to be allow'd, as is plain, especially by comparing it with the nineteenth,] α and as S. Jerom has observ'd, who even said the Council receiv'd the baptism of all hereticks, except the Paulianists : β and yet S. Basil doubts whether this baptism may be receiv'd. He allows of it only because some Bishops of Asia had receiv'd it, says he, out of condescension; γ and even in another place, after having said that there had been different decrees upon this point, and having objected to the Churches of Rome and Iconium which admitted of this baptism, he concludes for rejecting it, till a greater number of Bishops had met together and determin'd this point.

φ *Socr. n. p.* 9. 2. *a.*
α *Bas. ep. can.* 1. *p.* 22. *a.*
β *Bas. ep. can.* 1. *p.* 21. *a.*
χ *a.*
↓ *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 4. *p.* 237.
α *Hier. in Lucif. t.* 2. *p.* 147. *a.*
γ *can.* 47. *p.* 33, 34.

NOTE

NOTE XXII. referr'd to in §. 19. p. 654.

At what time the Biſhops preſented their petitions to Conſtantine againſt one another.

δ THE ſtory of the petitions, which the Biſhops preſented to Conſtantine againſt one another, happen'd according to Theodorit, partly before, partly after the reunion and pacification of the Prelates; that is after the deciſion concerning the faith, by which all the Prelates were united in appearance. ε Rufinus, Socrates, and Sozomen place it before that deciſion; ſome days before according to Sozomen. ζ Socrates makes it begin the evening before the ſolemn ſeſſion, and end the very day of that ſeſſion. [We have follow'd him in the firſt point: and we muſt neceſſarily do ſo, if we will ſay with Gelaſius Cyzicenus,] η that Conſtantine did not arrive at Nice till the day before that ſeſſion; [which is probable enough.]

NOTE XXIII. referr'd to in §. 19. p. 658.

The ſpuriouſneſs of the Council's epiſtle to S. Silveſter, and of that Pope's anſwer.

[THE barbarous and almoſt unintelligible ſtyle of the epiſtle which is reported to be written by the Council of Nice to S. Silveſter, is of itſelf enough to give us a judgment of the authority it may have, without having any occaſion to ask by vertue of what privilege S. Macarius is nam'd in the title rather than S. Alexander and S. Euſtathius.] θ But S. Euſtathius was mightily in the wrong that he could not tell how many Biſhops there were in this Council. [He had nothing to do but to read this title, *& cæteri epiſcopi* 318.] ι The Council of Chalcedon forgot likewiſe in the title of their letter to S. Leo to take notice of how many Biſhops it was compos'd; but it does not forget to tell the place where it met. κ The Council of Nice itſelf,

δ *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *p.* 552. *b.* ε *Ruf. l.* 1. *c.* 2. *p.* 231. | *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.* 21. *a.* | *Soz. l.* 1. *c.* 17. *p.* 430. *c, d.* ζ *Socr. p.* 21. *a.* η *Gel. Cyz. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 60. θ *Thdrt. l.* 1. *c.* 7. *p.* 543. *a.* ι *Bar.* 325. §. 170. κ *Conc. t.* 2. p. 60. *c.*

where it writes to the Churches of Egypt, mentions the place, and forgets the number: [the thing is without doubt, people were not us'd to take the three hundred and eighteen Bishops, and the Council of Nice for the same thing. S. Silvester's answer to the Council is of the same kind,] λ except that the blunder in the date and the mistakes which are in it, make Baronius himself believe that it is suppositious: [but certainly it is no more so than the other.] μ Father Labbé gives them both up.

NOTE XXIV. referr'd to in §. 20. p. 660.

Of the acts of the Council of Nice.

ν BAronius thinks, that there were acts of the Council of Nice written very carefully, but that they were destroy'd shortly after by the efforts of the Arians, ξ and that the dispute which happen'd in Honorius's reign betwixt the Churches of Africa and Rome, shews they were not in being from the beginning of the fifth century; ο that therefore what Turrianus affirms, that they are at present at Alexandria; what others pretend, that they are in Arabia; and what even Isidorus Mercator says, that some Easterns had assur'd him they had seen them themselves, that they were longer than the four Gospels, that they contain'd the several sessions of the Council, the controversies which were handled, the decisions, the definitions, and the subscriptions of the Bishops, and that the Council of Chalcedon was written upon this model, π all these things, says he, are in all likelihood no better than dreams.

[It is however difficult to believe, that the acts of the Council of Nice should be lost so soon, if they were ever written; but neither is this last point very certain.] ρ For the only passage of S. Athanasius which Baronius alledges for this, says nothing at all of it in the Greek. σ S. Jerom expresly cites the acts of the Council of Nice, [but what follows in him may make us judge, that he means by this term only some subscriptions of the Bishops. But if these acts were remaining in S. Jerom's time, it is indubitable that they were not lost in the time of Honorius and S. Augustin.] τ Socrates cites a book of S. Athanasius's, which he calls Synodicon, in which were the names of all the Prelates. [It was perhaps the copy which this Saint had of the decrees, Canons, &c. of the Council, without any thing else in it.]

λ *Bar.* 325. §. 171. μ *Conc.* p. 58. *b*, *c*. ν *Bar.* 325. §. 61.
ξ §. 62. ο §. 61. π §. 62. ρ §. 61. | *Euf.* n. p. 203. 2. *c*. | *Ath. de syn.* p. 873. *c*. σ *Hier. in Luci.* c. 7. p. 144. *c*.
τ *Socr. l.* 1. *c.* 13. p. 43. *b*.

Vale-

υ Valeſius is of opinion, that nothing elſe was ſet down in writing but what had been reſolv'd on in full Council, and ſubſcrib'd by all the Biſhops, [as the Creed, the Canons, the other decrees, the anathema of Arius, and the ſynodical epiſtles.] φ He grounds his opinion upon Euſebius who is not expreſs, χ and likewiſe upon this, that a perſon having deſir'd to know of S. Athanaſius what was done in the Council relating to the word *Conſubſtantial*, this Saint inſtead of ſending him the acts of the ſynod, wrote a book for his information, entituled, Of the decrees of the Council of Nice againſt the Arians.

ψ Gelaſius Cyzicenus, as he is call'd, [who liv'd at the end of the V century,] ſays that he found at his father's houſe a very old book, which belong'd formerly to Dalmatius Archbiſhop of Cyzicus, ω and that this book contain'd a general account of all that was ſaid and done in the Council of Nice. α But he himſelf makes his own teſtimony ſuſpected, by ſaying afterwards that in order to find out all that paſs'd in this Council, he had ſearch'd every where and every way, and had made uſe of all ſorts of means for that end. Why was it neceſſary to be ſo very diligent in his enquiries? He had nothing to do but to publiſh his book: Was that loſt already? This is without probability, or at leaſt it was worth the while to have ſaid ſo. The book which he compos'd afterwards out of ſo many enquiries, and which we have ſtill remaining, is in part nothing but a jumble of Euſebius, Rufinus, and other Eccleſiaſtical authors, in whoſe text he ſometimes inſerts ſome important matters, without giving us any notice of it. The reſt conſiſts of ſeveral pieces, letters, ſpeeches, or diſputes, β which is what he tranſcrib'd from Dalmatius's book: But theſe things are by no means receiv'd as authentick; and they are not thought very ſtrongly ſupported, when they ſtand only upon the teſtimony ı of this author. [And there is ſtill leſs credit given to Gregory, whom others call George, Prieſt of the Church of Cæſarea in Cappadocia,] γ who has made an oration upon the three hundred and eighteen Fathers of the Council of Nice, at the beginning of the VII century according to Bollandus, δ or not before the Xth according to Voſſius. Surius has likewiſe given us upon the 10th of July a ſhort hiſtory of the beginning of Arianiſm, taken from Metaphraſtes. [It is too full of faults to be minded.]

ı See Zeno the Emperor.

υ *Euſ. n. p. p.* 223. 2. *c.* φ *c.* | υ. *Conſ. l.* 3. *c.* 14. *p.* 490. *d.* χ *Ath. dec. N. p.* 250. *b.* ψ *Gel. Cyz. l.* 1. *p.* 2. ω *p.* 1. α *p.* 5. β *p.* 28. γ *Boll.* 13. *jan. p.* 781. §. 1. δ *Voſſ. hi. g. l.* 4. *c.* 19. *p.* 491.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE, OR, AN ABRIDGMENT OF THE Principal Things contain'd in the foregoing HISTORY, plac'd according to the order of time.

A.D.

312. ACHillas receives Arius into the Church, and advances him to the Prieſthood in 312. *p.* 4.

314. Euſtolius of Nicomedia, who had aſſiſted at the Council of Ancyra, being dead, Euſebius Biſhop of Berytus takes poſſeſſion of that Church before the year 319, by the favour of Licinius. *p.* 17.

319. Arius's character. *p.* 2, 3. He begins perhaps about the year 319 to diſturb the Church with his hereſy.

A. D.

319. *p.* 3—9, 495—499. S. Alexander Biſhop of Alexandria endeavours to recover him by mildneſs, condemns him in an aſſembly of his Clergy, and afterwards in a Council of an hundred Biſhops of Egypt. *p.* 7. Of his diſciples. *p.* 9—13. He leaves Egypt, goes into Syria where he finds both partiſans and adverſaries. *p.* 13—16. Paulinus of Tyre and Theodotus of Laodicea are for him. *p.* 16.

320. Arius retires to Nicomedia to Euſebius, who gets him receiv'd in the Councils of Bithynia and Paleſtine. *p.* 22, 25.

An account of Euſebius of Nicomedia. *p.* 17—22.

Arius writes to S. Alexander from Nicomedia: He compoſes his Thalia there. *p.* 22—24. He changes the *Gloria Patri*. *p.* 28. The two Euſebius's, George of Laodicea, and ſeveral others write in his favour. *p.* 25—28.

324. Conſtantine ſends Hoſius of Corduba into Egypt, who holds a Council there, in which the Arians are condemn'd. *p.* 29, 30.

Arius complains to Conſtantine, who anſwers him with a great deal of ſtrength. *p.* 30, 31, 502, 503. Arius comes to him, and endeavours to deceive him, but in vain. *p.* 33, 503.

325. Conſtantine cauſes the Council of Nice to be held, which begins in all probability upon the 19th of June 325, and continues till the 25th of Auguſt. He comes to it after the 3d of July. *p.* 596, 598, 613—617. The hiſtory of this Council. *p.* 595, *&c.* S. James of Niſibis and S. Spiridio aſſiſt at it. Of the principal Biſhops who were at it. *p.* 598—610. Of the Arian Biſhops who were there. *p.* 610—613. Arius with his diſciples is anathematiz'd by it, and baniſh'd: The Euſebians ſign the Conſubſtantiality there. *p.* 627.

Euſebius and Theognis ſupport the Melitians, and communicate with ſome Arians whom Conſtantine had caus'd to come to Court in order to puniſh them. *p.* 35. Upon this account they are depos'd and baniſh'd three months after the Council of Nice. *p.* 35—37.

328. Euſebius and Theognis are recall'd and reſtor'd to their ſees three years after their baniſhment, at the end of 328 or the beginning of 329. *p.* 38, 39.

329. It ſeems probable, that about 329 S. Euſtathius might hold a Council at Antioch of the provinces of the Eaſt, the Canons of which may be mix'd with thoſe of the Council of the Dedication in 341. *p.* 519—522.

330. Conſtantine writes to Arius upon the 27th of November 330, to recall him from baniſhment, and ſend him to Alexandria. *p.* 40—44, 505—507, 514.

S. Parthenius is made Biſhop of Lampſacus about the year 330. *p.* 191.

S. Eu-

A. D.

331. S. Euſtathius Biſhop of Antioch is depos'd in 331 by the Euſebians in a Council, and baniſh'd to Philippi in Macedonia, where he dies in all likelihood before the year 338. *p.* 45. Paulinus of Tyre is put in his place and governs but ſix months: He inſtructs Aëtius. *p.* 47 —— 49, 209.

Aſclepas of Gaza is depos'd probably with S. Euſtathius, and Quintian put in his place. *p.* 45, 46, 508.

Paulinus who intruded into S. Euſtathius's place, being dead, Eulalius ſucceeds him: He drives Aëtius from Antioch. *p.* 49, 409. Several Catholicks refuſe to ſubmit to theſe Arian uſurpers, and are call'd Euſtathians. *p.* 51.

Euſebius of Nicomedia unites with the Melitians about 331: He endeavours, but in vain, to oblige S. Athanaſius to receive Arius to communion. *p.* 55, 56.

332. S. Eutropius of Adrianople is baniſh'd after S. Euſtathius, at the beginning of the year 332 at the lateſt. *p.* 52.

The Church of Antioch is diſturb'd after the death of Eulalius: The Euſebians have a mind to place Euſebius of Cæſarea there, who refuſes it; and they elect Euphronius, who holds this ſee but a little above a year. *p.* 49 —— 51.

333. Euphronius of Antioch being dead, Placcillus is put in his place in the year 333 or 334. *p.* 51.

334. S. Macarius of Jeruſalem dies about the year 334: S. Maximus a Confeſſor ſucceeds him. *p.* 53.

335. The Euſebians meet to dedicate the Church of Jeruſalem in 335. *p.* 57 —— 59. At the ſame time they receive Arius and his followers. *p.* 62 —— 64, 512 —— 516. They cite Marcellus of Ancyra as an heretick. *p.* 64 —— 68.

S. Athanaſius goes to Conſtantine, who ſends for his accuſers, and upon a new calumny baniſhes the Saint to Treves. *p.* 64, 65.

Arius after having been receiv'd at Jeruſalem, goes and diſturbs the Church of Alexandria. *p.* 70.

336. The Euſebians hold a Council at Conſtantinople in 336. *p.* 69, 70. They condemn Marcellus of Ancyra in it, *p.* 66, put Baſil in his place, and draw up a new confeſſion. *p.* 66, 67.

Conſtantine makes Arius come to Conſtantinople, who impoſes upon him: But God hearing the prayers of S. Alexander of Conſtantinople and S. James of Niſibis, deſtroys this Arch-heretick miſerably one Saturday in the evening, when he expected to be receiv'd the next day into the Church. *p.* 71 —— 75.

Conſtantine baniſhes John Archaph the Chief of the Melitians. *p.* 77.

Euſebius of Nicomedia endeavours to uſurp the ſee of Conſtantinople, but cannot. *p.* 77.

A. D.

337. The Arians gain Conſtantius's affections in 337. *p.* 78——81.

338. S. Athanaſius and the other Biſhops baniſh'd in Conſtantine's reign, are recall'd in 338. *p.* 82, 83.

The Euſebians raiſe new calumnies againſt S. Athanaſius after his return to Alexandria, make Piſtus Biſhop of the Arians of Alexandria, perhaps in 339. *p.* 82, 83.

An account of Acacius Euſebius of Cæſarea's ſucceſſor. *p.* 84——86.

About the end of the year 338, or a little after, Conſtantius comes to Conſtantinople, gets S. Paul depos'd by a Council of the Arians, and puts Euſebius of Nicomedia into his place. *p.* 83.

340. Marcellus, Aſclepas, S. Lucius of Adrianople, S. Paul, Hellanicus of Tripolis, and many others who were perſecuted and turn'd out by the Arians in 340, come, as is thought, to Rome before the middle of 341. *p.* 87——90, 517.

340. Pope Julius in the year 340 writes and ſends a deputation to the Euſebians, to preſs them to come to the Council of Rome order'd to meet in June 341. *p.* 86, 87, 91, 92.

341. The Euſebians hold a Council at Antioch for the dedication of the great Church. *p.* 93, 94. They draw up ſeveral Creeds there, and make ſome Canons both good and bad ones. *p.* 98--107. The 25 Canons which are aſcrib'd to that Synod, may belong to different Councils. *p.* 519--522. This Council offers the biſhoprick of Alexandria to one Euſebius, who refuſes it, and accepts that of Emiſa: An account of this Euſebius. *p.* 94——98.

Gregory of Cappadocia is put in S. Athanaſius's place by this Council. *p.* 95.

The Pope's legates come from the Eaſt in June with letters from the Council of Antioch. *p.* 107.

Euſebius of Nicomedia dies, before Julius's letter arriv'd in the Weſt, that is about the end of 341. *p.* 107, 108, 526, 527.

S. Paul of Conſtantinople is reſtor'd and put in Euſebius's place; the Euſebians ſet up againſt him Macedonius the Arch-heretick, and make him Biſhop. *p.* 108.

Eudoxius was Biſhop of Germanicia in the year 341: The qualities of this heretick. *p.* 232, 233.

342. General Hermogenes endeavouring to turn S. Paul out of Conſtantinople in 342, is kill'd by the people. *p.* 109.

Conſtantius comes from Antioch to Conſtantinople in winter, and turns S. Paul out, leaving Macedonius in poſſeſſion only of his own Church. *p.* 109. 110.

Philip puts Macedonius in poſſeſſion of the Churches of Conſtantinople, which occaſions a very great ſlaughter. *p.* 110, 111.

The

A. D.

342. The Euſebians ſend Narciſſus and ſome others into Gaul upon a deputation to Conſtans, who ſends them back without doing any thing: S. Maximinus of Treves refuſes them the communion. *p.* 111 -- 113, 528.

Photinus Biſhop of Sirmium publiſhes his hereſy in the year 342, or ſhortly after, before 345: An account of this Arch-heretick. *p.* 114 -- 116.

344. It ſeems probable, that about the year 344 Valens of Murſa endeavour'd, but in vain, to uſurp the ſee of Aquilea. Fortunatianus is made Biſhop of that place. *p.* 117.

Theognis of Nice dies about 344. *p.* 117.

345. The Euſebians being aſſembled in the year 345, perhaps at Antioch, ſend their long confeſſion into the Weſt. *p.* 118. The Council of Milan rejects their deputies, becauſe they refuſe to condemn Arius's hereſy. *p.* 119, 529, 530.

Stephen about 345 ſucceeds Placcillus Biſhop of Antioch, and governs three years. *p.* 119.

346. Of the Council of Cologn againſt Euphrates Biſhop of that city, held on the 12th of May 346. *p.* 120, 530——534.

347. The Eaſterns refuſe to join the Council of Sardica in 347, *p.* 120, 121, and condemn the principal perſons of that ſynod in their aſſembly of Philippopolis. *p.* 123, 124.

The troubles of the Church increaſe. *p.* 125, 126.

The outrages of the Euſebians in their return from Philippopolis: They cauſe ſeveral Eccleſiaſticks of Adrianople to be put to death, and ſend S. Lucius Biſhop of that city into baniſhment, where he dies. *p.* 127 — 129, 534, 535. They likewiſe baniſh Diodorus, Macarius, Aſterius, Olympius, Theodulus, all Biſhops, and ſome Prieſts of Alexandria in 347 or at the beginning of 348. *p.* 127——129.

The Council of Milan againſt Photinus, *p.* 129 130, 535, which is not that in which Demophilus, Macedonius &c. refus'd to condemn Arius's hereſy. *p.* 529, 530. Urſacius and Valens make a ſort of a ſubmiſſion there, but not a ſatisfactory one. *p.* 130.

348. Conſtans writes to Conſtantius in 348, by the deputies of the Council of Sardica, to whom he joins his own, to have the baniſh'd Biſhops recall'd: Conſtantius grants it. *p.* 131. Theſe deputies were at Antioch at Eaſter, where Stephen attempts to blacken their character by a piece of diabolical malice. But it is diſcover'd, Stephen depos'd, and Leontius put in his place. He governs near ten years. *p.* 131, 231. Leontius's character: Flavian and Diodorus maintain the faith againſt him. *p.* 131--136.

Con-

A. D.

348. Conſtantius about Eaſter recalls the exil'd Biſhops. *p.* 136--138.

349. S. Athanaſius ſees Apollinarius at Laodicea in 349, and paſſes through Jeruſalem, where S. Maximus aſſembles a Council in his favour. *p.* 138.

Marcellus and Aſclepas return to their Churches in 349. *p.* 136, 137.

Urſacius and Valens retract all that they had ſaid againſt S. Athanaſius, and write letters of peace to him about the end of 349. *p.* 138.

The Weſtern Biſhops hold a Council at Sirmium againſt Photinus, whom they cannot yet depoſe. They write of him to the Eaſterns. *p.* 139.

350. S. Maximus of Jeruſalem dies perhaps the 5th of May 350, and at the lateſt at the beginning of 351 : S. Cyril ſucceeds him : Difficulties relating to his ordination. *p.* 141.

S. Paul of Conſtantinople being oblig'd to leave that city, is carry'd to Cucuſus, and ſtrangled by Philip the Prefect at the end of 350 at ſooneſt. *p.* 140. S. Martyrius a Subdeacon and S. Marcian a Reader may have been martyr'd immediately after in baniſhment at the inſtigation of Macedonius on the 25th of October. *p.* 202.

The Hiſtory of Aëtius ; his impieties : Leontius of Antioch makes him Deacon about the end of the year 350, and is oblig'd to depoſe him immediately. *p.* 207--216.

351. The appearance of the Croſs over the city of Jeruſalem on the 7th of May 351 : S. Cyril gives an account of it to Conſtantius, to whom he had not written before. *p.* 141.

Valens of Murſa gains an advantage for Arianiſm from the battle of Murſa. *p.* 142.

The Euſebians endeavour to renew the perſecution. *p.* 142. They hold the great Council of Sirmium, in which they depoſe Photinus, and draw up a new confeſſion of faith. *p.* 143--149, 537, 538.

Of the followers of Photinus : Germinius an Arian is put in his place. *p.* 148, 149.

Aëtius inſinuates himſelf into Gallus's favour, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of Baſil of Ancyra and Euſtathius of Sebaſtia. *p.* 214, 215.

352. Pope Julius dies upon the 12th of April 352 : Liberius is elected in his place upon the 22d of May, and governs fourteen years, four months, and two days. *p.* 149, 150.

Liberius in the year 352 receives the letters which the Arians and Euſebians had directed to Julius his predeceſſor againſt S. Athanaſius. *p.* 150.

Conſtan-

A. D.

352. Constantine makes Epictetus Bishop of Civita-Vecchia about the year 352 or a little after. *p.* 179.

353. The Eusebians, about the beginning of the year 353, endeavour to make S. Athanasius go from Alexandria, upon a forg'd letter from him to Constantius. *p.* 151.

Constantius causes a Council to be held at Arles in 353 or the year following, in which all the Bishops consent to the condemnation of Photinus, Marcellus, and S. Athanasius; even Vincentius of Capua who came from Liberius to desire a Council to be call'd at Aquilea. *p.* 151--154. S. Paulinus of Treves stands up for S. Athanasius by himself, and is banish'd. *p.* 154, 155, 538.

354. Gallus in 354 executes Eusebius of Emisa surnam'd Pittacus, who was probably a lawyer. *p.* 524, 525.

Liberius writes to Constantius to get a Council call'd, and makes great solicitations to obtain it as well by Lucifer of Cagliari, Pancratius a Priest, and Hilary a Deacon, as by S. Eusebius of Vercellæ and Fortunatianus of Aquilea. *p.* 156.

S. Parthenius, illustrious for his miracles, govern'd the Church of Lampsacus in the year 354. *p.* 189--193. He cures Theodorus of Heraclea, who dies shortly after between 351 and 356. Hypatian is put in his place. *p.* 189.

355. Constantius calls the Council of Milan at the beginning of the year 355. *p.* 157. The Eusebians propose there in the name of the Emperor a confession of faith entirely Arian: The people reject it. *p.* 157, 158, 160. We do not find that it was sign'd, but the condemnation of S. Athanasius was sign'd. *p.* 159. The fall of Eremus of Thessalonica and Fortunatianus of Aquilea in particular is taken notice of. *ibid.*

Auxentius is put in the place of S. Dionysius of Milan, who was banish'd for having retracted his subscription. *p.* 161. He dies in exile, but we do not know the year of his death. *p.* 158, 288.

An account in general of the persecution of the Church by Constantius in the year 355. *p.* 162--178

The history of S. Maximus of Naples and Rufinian the Martyr. *p.* 193-195.

Constantius about the middle of this year sends to Hosius to come to him; and not being able to gain him, he sends him back to Corduba. *p.* 195. He heaps favours upon Epictetus Bishop of Centumcellæ, whom he had gain'd. *p.* 179.

Pope Liberius couragiously opposes at Rome and Milan (after the sixth of July 355 and the death of Silvanus) the efforts of Constantius and Eusebius the eunuch. He is banish'd to Berea in Thrace, *p.* 180--187, whither he is accompany'd by Damasus Deacon and

A. D.

355. and afterwards Biſhop of Rome. *p.* 187. Felix who intruded into his place, is ſtrenuouſly oppos'd by the people, but follow'd by part of the Clergy contrary to their oath. *p.* 187, 188.

S. Hilary and other Biſhops of France may have preſented about the year 355 a petition to Conſtantius for the Catholicks againſt the Arians. *p.* 198.

356. George is ordain'd at Antioch Biſhop of Alexandria in 356, by a Council of thirty Arians, who draw up a new creed. *p.* 196, 197.

A general perſecution of the Catholick Biſhops of Egypt, ſome of whom are baniſh'd, others oblig'd to fly, and ſome die with the fatigues of their baniſhment. *p.* 196, 197.

George re-ordains the Biſhops who ſubmit to him. *p.* 197.

Aëtius comes to Alexandria, where Eunomius joins him. *p.* 215, 216.

The hiſtory of Eunomius. *p.* 330, 331.

The errors of the Eunomians. *p.* 218.

In the year 356, before the month of June, the Council of Biterræ was held, in which S. Hilary oppoſing Saturninus and the other Arians, and being perhaps depos'd, was baniſh'd into Phrygia by Conſtantius, with S. Rhodanus of Thouloufe who died there. *p.* 198.

The deplorable condition in which S. Hilary finds Aſia. *p.* 198, 199.

Macedonius, with Marathonius and Eleuſius of Cyzicus his partiſans, commits great cruelties at Conſtantinople againſt the Catholicks, of whom S. Martyrius and S. Marcian are beheaded, *p.* 200--203, and againſt the Novatians who refuſe however to unite themſelves to the Catholick Church. *p.* 203--205. Agelius was then their Biſhop at Conſtantinople. *p.* 203.

Macedonius cauſes Conſtantine's corpſe to be remov'd from the Church of the Apoſtles into that of S. Acacius: which occaſions a great deal of diſturbance and many murders at Conſtantinople. The year in which this happen'd, is not known. *p.* 206.

Of the ſeveral diviſions of the Arians or Eunomians, Semiarians, and Macedonians. *p.* 216, &c.

357. The people of Rome in the year 357 deſire of Conſtantius with great ſolicitations that Pope Liberius may be recall'd. *p.* 221--223.

The ſecond confeſſion of faith of Sirmium perfectly impious, drawn up in July 357 or ſhortly after, by the heretical Biſhops of the Weſt. *p.* 223--227.

An account of Potamus Biſhop of Lisbon. *p.* 225.

Pope Liberius ſigns the firſt confeſſion of Sirmium at Berea, and embraces the communion of the Arians, that he may be reſtor'd. This was at the end of 357 or the beginning of 358. *p.* 227--230.

Leon-

A. D.

357. Leontius of Antioch dies about the end of 357. *p.* 231.
The difference between Acacius of Cæsarea and S. Cyril of Jerusalem, who being depos'd by Acacius in a Council, retires to Antioch after the death of Leontius, and from thence to Tarsus, where Silvanus receives him notwithstanding Acacius. Eutyches is put in S. Cyril's place. *p.* 234--236.

358. Eudoxius of Germanicia hearing of the death of Leontius, hastens from Sirmium into the East, and seizes upon the Bishoprick of Antioch about the beginning of 358. *p.* 231, 232, 549, 550. He continues there two years. *p.* 323.
The Prelates of France a little before the Council of Ancyra reject the second confession of Sirmium. They write about the same time to S. Hilary. *p.* 237.
S. Phebadius of Agen writes a piece in which he refutes that confession. *p.* 238.
Aëtius returns to Antioch after the election of Eudoxius, who has a mind to restore him to the Diaconate, but cannot do it. *p.* 239, 240.
Eudoxius establishes the doctrine of the Anomœans in a Council at Antioch. *p.* 240. George of Laodicea writes against this to Basil of Ancyra and others. Basil before Easter assembles a Council at Ancyra of twelve Semiarian Bishops, who condemn the Anomœans together with the Consubstantiality, and write to all the Bishops. *p.* 241, 242.
Basil, Eustathius, and Eleusius being deputed by the Council of Ancyra to Constantius, make the Anomœans and Liberius sign their anathema's and confession, and retract the second confession of Sirmium, which is even suppress'd. *p.* 243, *&c.*
The Semiarians cause seventy of the Anomœans to be banish'd: Aëtius and Eunomius, who were ordain'd Deacons by Eudoxius, are banish'd into Phrygia, and Eudoxius retires into Armenia. *p.* 246, *&c.*
Liberius returns to Rome, perhaps upon the second of August. Felix is turn'd out of that city, together with the Ecclesiasticks of his communion. *p.* 249, 250.
The history of S. Eusebius Priest of Rome is plac'd in 358. *p.* 251.
Constantius having call'd a General Council at Nicomedia, a great earthquake destroys that city upon Monday the 24th of August. Cecrops, the Bishop of the place, is kill'd by it. *p.* 253, 254.
The Anomœans are recall'd from exile, and get the General Council divided into two. *p.* 255, *&c.*
S. Paulinus of Treves dies this year in Phrygia, perhaps upon the 31st of August. *p.* 155, 288, 538.

359. A new confession of faith drawn up at Sirmium, and dated the 22d of May 359. *p.* 258--260.

Con-

A. D. 359.

Conſtantius cauſes the Biſhops to meet at Seleucia and Ariminum in 359. *p.* 256, 258, 261. He writes to the Council of Ariminum, and ſends thither Taurus the *Præfectus Prætorio*. *p.* 263. This Council rejects all the Creeds, except that of Nice, and upon the 21ſt of July condemns Urſacius, Valens, Caius, Germinius, and perhaps Auxentius. *p.* 264, &c. The Catholicks and Arians ſend deputies to Conſtantius; he endeavours by his delays to diſcourage thoſe of the Catholicks, of whom Reſtitutus of Carthage was the chief. *p.* 267, &c. The Council deſires, that the lands of the Church may be free from taxes. *p.* 269.

The Catholick deputies are overcome by the delays and artifices of the Arians about the 10th of October, and ſign a confeſſion at Nicæ, *p.* 270--272, 561, 562, which is at laſt receiv'd by all the Biſhops of the Council, who were conquer'd or impos'd upon. *p.* 273, &c. The Council ſends to Conſtantius Urſacius, Valens, and ſome others, who triumph upon account of their victory over the Catholicks. *p.* 278, 279.

Pope Liberius and ſome few others of the Weſt reject the Council of Ariminum. *p.* 280, 281. Gregory of Eliberis was one of that number, and S. Euſebius of Vercellæ commends him for it. *p.* 281.

The perſecution which is pretended to have follow'd the Council of Ariminum. *p.* 283, &c.

The Council of Seleucia begins upon the 27th of September: S. Hilary is preſent at it. *p.* 286, 287. S. Athanaſius ſeems to have come to Seleucia at that time. *p.* 288.

The Acacians being ſeparated from the Semiarians, the latter proceed againſt the former, and depoſe and excommunicate ſeveral of them. *p.* 289, &c. They reſtore S. Cyril, and make Anianus Biſhop of Antioch: But the latter is baniſh'd immediately. *p.* 300.

The Semiarians of Seleucia having ſent a deputation to the Emperor, the Acacians are before-hand with them, and ſet Conſtantius againſt them. *p.* 300--302.

There were ſeveral diſputes at Conſtantinople in 359, between the Anomœans or Acacians and the Semiarians, before Conſtantius and Honoratus the Prefect: Conſtantius ſupports the Acacians, but yet will have Aëtius condemn'd and baniſh'd. *p.* 303--309.

S. Baſil will not engage in theſe diſputes. *p.* 307, 308.

The deputies of the Council of Ariminum communicate with the Acacians at Conſtantinople, notwithſtanding the remonſtrances of the Semiarians. *p.* 309, 310.

Conſtantius makes the Semiarians ſign the confeſſion of Ariminum upon the laſt day of the year 359. *p.* 311, 312.

S. Par-

A. D.

359. S. Parthenius Biſhop of Lampſacus was dead before the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 191. The hiſtory of this Saint. *p.* 189--193.

360. The Acacians being united with the deputies of Ariminum, get a Council to meet at Conſtantinople in January 360, where they cauſe the confeſſion of Ariminum to be ſign'd, *p.* 312, *&c.* (Ulphilas Biſhop of the Goths is preſent at it, and ſigns that confeſſion. *p.* 459.) and ſend it all over the empire with an order from the Emperor to have it ſign'd. *p.* 284. They likewiſe condemn Aëtius and ſome of his partiſans, *p.* 314--318, and afterwards depoſe and baniſh theſe Semiarians, Macedonius, Baſil, Eleuſius of Cyzicus, Euſtathius, Eortaſius of Sardis, Dracontius of Pergamus, Silvanus, Sophronius, Neo, Elpidius, and S. Cyril. *p.* 318--323.

Eudoxius is plac'd in the ſee of Conſtantinople in the room of Macedonius upon the 27th of January, and by his blaſphemies makes the dedication of the great Church of S. Sophia famous on the 15th of February. *p.* 323, 324.

Aëtius is baniſh'd to Mopſueſtia, and afterwards to Amblada. *p.* 317.

Several Biſhops are put in the places of the depos'd ones, among others Athanaſius at Ancyra, Eunomius at Cyzicus, and perhaps at the ſame time S. Pelagius at Laodicea. *p.* 325——327.

The ſigning of the confeſſion of Ariminum fills the Church with dreadful troubles, and makes almoſt all the Biſhops to fall. *p.* 328, 329.

While the Council of Conſtantinople was ſitting, S. Hilary deſires an audience of Conſtantius to defend the faith, and writes his book againſt that prince. He is ſent back to Poictiers. *p.* 325.

Eudoxius is oblig'd by Conſtantius to depoſe Eunomius from the biſhoprick of Cyzicus. *p.* 330——337. Eunomius after this forms a ſeparate communion from Eudoxius. *p.* 337.

Macedonius begins likewiſe to form a ſeparate ſect after his depoſition. *p.* 322.

Auxentius was Biſhop of Mopſueſtia in the year 360: An account of him. *p.* 317.

361. The blaſphemies of Eunomius in a ſermon preach'd at Conſtantinople upon the day of the Epiphany in 361. *p.* 336.

Conſtantius at the beginning of 361 aſſembles a Council at Antioch, in which S. Meletius is elected Biſhop of that city by the general conſent both of the hereticks and Catholicks. *p.* 350, 351.

The Council of Antioch confirms perhaps the depoſition of Eunomius who was accus'd by Acacius, and baniſhes him into Pamphylia. *p.* 337, 338.

S. Me-

A.D.

361. S. Meletius, thirty days after he was receiv'd at Antioch, is baniſh'd to Melitene by the faction of Eudoxius and the other Arians, who put Euzoïus into his place. *p.* 352.

The Orthodox of Antioch continue in communion with S. Meletius, ſeparate from the Arians, meet in the Palæa or Old Church, and endeavour but in vain to unite with the Euſtathians. *p.* 352, 353.

The Arians draw up their laſt confeſſion at Antioch, which they afterwards abandon. They begin to be call'd Anomœans and Exoucontians. A liſt of their XVI confeſſions. *p.* 353--356.

The deplorable ſtate of the Church at the time of Conſtantius's death: Julian recalls all who had been baniſh'd for the faith, particularly Aëtius, Photinus, and Stephen of Antioch; and allows every body the free exerciſe of their religion. *p.* 339, 357--361.

Julian writes to Photinus, *p.* 147, and to Aëtius. *p.* 339.

The Biſhops who fell in the Council of Ariminum, retract their ſubſcription in 361, continue in their ſtations, and in the communion of the Confeſſors. *p.* 281, 282.

362. The Catholick faith is reſtor'd every where in 362. *p.* 360.

The Semiarians being return'd from baniſhment, form a new body call'd the Macedonians. They are re-eſtabliſh'd in Aſia and in ſome provinces of Pontus, hold a Council at Zela, condemn the Acacians and the confeſſion of Ariminum, confirm the Council of Seleucia and the ὁμοιούσιον. *p.* 361--365.

Aëtius being recall'd by Julian, is abſolv'd by Euzoïus, and made Biſhop by his own people with others of his ſect. *p.* 339, 340, 365.

363. Jovian in the year 363 rejects the petitions of the Macedonians and other hereticks, and makes S. Athanaſius come to Antioch. *p.* 365, 366.

Zozimus who intruded into the biſhoprick of Naples, is puniſh'd by God, renounces the epiſcopate, and lives in a ſtate of penance. *p.* 194.

364. Aëtius ordains ſeveral Biſhops in Jovian's reign in 364, and ſeparates openly from the Eudoxian Arians. *p.* 339.

Valentinian declares to the Macedonians about the middle of May 364, that he will not meddle with religious diſputes. *p.* 369.

Aëtius and Eunomius being perſecuted by the Arians, retire one into the iſle of Lesbos, and Eunomius near Chalcedon. *p.* 340.

365. The Macedonians hold their Council at Lampſacus about Auguſt 365. *p.* 370, 371, 571, 572.

Aca-

A. D.

365. Acacius of Cæsarea might be engag'd in the year 365 with the Arians, and die shortly after. *p.* 372. His succession is disputed by Philumenus, Cyril, and Gelasius: Euzoïus the Arian carries it at last, and holds it till the reign of Theodosius the Great. *p.* 426, 427.

Felix whom the Arians put into Liberius's place, dies upon the 22d of November 365. *p.* 252. After his death Liberius receives those who had follow'd him, according to their several orders. *ibid.*

366. Aëtius is upon the point of having his head cut off by Procopius's orders. *p.* 340.

The Arians hold an assembly at Nicomedia in 366: Valens persecutes the Macedonians, the Novatians, and the Catholicks. *p.* 373 -- 377. He comes to Cæsarea, where S. Basil is call'd upon by Eusebius the Bishop to defend the Church against him. *p.* 572.

The Macedonians resolve in several assemblies to join the communion of the Westerns, and embrace the Nicene faith. Their deputies are receiv'd by Liberius and the other Westerns. *p.* 378--382, 385.

Liberius dies upon the 24th of September: Damasus succeeds him about the beginning of October. *p.* 383, 384, 573.

Germinius of Sirmium about December 366 quarrels with Ursacius, Valens, and the other pure Arians of Illyricum, and embraces the party of the Semiarians. *p.* 385-387.

367. The Council of Tyanæ receives the Macedonians in the beginning of the spring in the year 367, orders that of Tarsus to meet, which Valens prevents. *p.* 387--389.

The Council of Antioch in Caria, in which thirty four Macedonians declare against the reunion. *p.* 389.

Valens turns out all the Bishops who were banish'd in Constantius's reign. *p.* 389.

368. Valens comes to Tomi in Scythia in 368, cannot make S. Bretanio communicate with the Arians, banishes him, and recalls him quickly after. *p.* 391, 392, 578.

Aëtius being driven by the Clergy from Constantinople, where he liv'd at that time, complains of it to Eudoxius in vain, and dies shortly after. *p.* 340.

369. Eunomius being banish'd into Mauritania by Auxonius, is recall'd in 369 by the interest of Valens of Mursa and Domninus of Marcianople. *p.* 341.

We must place perhaps in 369 a Council of Rome, in which Ursacius and Valens were condemn'd; as a consequence of which the Council of Alexandria desir'd the condemnation of Auxentius, and wrote to the Church of Africa against the Council of Ariminum. *p.* 393.

370. Valens being at Nicomedia, hears there of the death of Eudoxius, and puts Demophilus of Berea into his

A. D.

370. place about September 370. In the meantime, the Catholicks chooſe Evagrius, who is baniſh'd: They ſend a deputation to Valens of eighty Eccleſiaſticks, who are burnt upon the ſea, perhaps on the fifth of September. This crime is puniſh'd by famine. *p.* 341, 394--400.

—— Modeſtus the *Præfectus Prætorio* baniſhes Eunomius to an Iſland while he was Prefect. *p.* 341.

371. Flavian and Diodorus, S. Meletius's Prieſts, govern the Church of Antioch in 371. *p.* 409--412.

Valens begins in 371 a violent perſecution againſt all the Catholicks: A general deſcription of this perſecution. *p.* 400--405.

372. The perſecution of the Church of Antioch by Valens, *p.* 409--412, of the other Churches of Syria, *p.* 414--417, and of thoſe of Paleſtine. *p.* 425--427.

S. Julian Saba comes to defend the faith at Antioch. *p.* 413.

S. Barſes Biſhop of Edeſſa is baniſh'd to ſeveral places. The courage of his people. *p.* 417, *&c.* The hiſtory of S. Eulogius and S. Protogenes Prieſts of Edeſſa, afterwards Biſhops. *p.* 421.

373. S. Athanaſius dies upon the 2d of May 371 or 373: Peter is made his ſucceſſor by the Catholicks, and turn'd out by the Arians, who put Lucius in his place. This intruſion is follow'd with a great perſecution of the whole Church. Peter abſconds, writes to all the Orthodox, and afterwards retires to Rome. *p.* 427-442.

The Arians obtain ſome orders from Valens againſt S. Baſil: They are immediately revok'd. *p.* 443.

S. Pelagius of Laodicea is baniſh'd into Arabia after the year 372. *p.* 416.

Silvanus of Tarſus and Athanaſius of Ancyra die in 373. *p.* 443.

—— An heretical Biſhop is fix'd at Tarſus in 373. *ibid.*

374. The Church of Suedra in Pamphylia unites with the Catholicks in 374. *p.* 443, 444.

S. Amphilochius is made Archbiſhop of Iconium in the year 374. *p.* 444.

—— S. Euſebius of Samoſata is baniſh'd into Thrace. *ibid.* The Arians put Eunomius in his place. *ibid.*

375. Valentinian cauſes a Council to be held in Illyricum in 375, which embraces the Conſubſtantiality, depoſes ſix Arian Biſhops, writes and ſends a deputation into Aſia againſt the Macedonians. *p.* 444--446, 575--577.

Valentinian forbids the perſecution of the Orthodox in the Eaſt. *p.* 446--448. Some (but without any ground) place in the year 375 the Council of Laodicea, which was held in all likelihood between 341 and 381. *p.* 449, 450.

Demoſthenes Lieutenant of Pontus holds a Council of Arians at Ancyra, perſecutes the Catholicks in Cappadocia, turns out Hypſius of Parnaſſus in Cappadocia, and S. Gregory Nyſſen about Chriſtmas. *p.* 451--454.

The

A. D.

376. The Macedonians hold a Council at Cyzicus in 376. *p.* 454.

Valens, after the death of Valentinian, will make the hermits turn ſoldiers, perſecutes very much thoſe of Nitria, and makes many of them Martyrs. *p.* 455, 456.

Some monaſteries of Syria are burnt at Eaſter in 376. *p.* 456.

Euzoïus, Biſhop of the Arians at Antioch, dies in 376: Dorotheus ſucceeds him. *p.* 456, 457.

Photinus the Arch-heretick dies in 376. *p.* 148.

Ulphilas Biſhop of the Goths makes them embrace Arianiſm to pleaſe Valens. *p.* 457--464, 586, 587.

—— The Church of Jeruſalem was govern'd in 376 by one Hilario in communion with the Arians. *p.* 426.

378. Valens in 378 ceaſes from perſecuting the Catholicks: Peter returns to the ſee of Alexandria, and turns out Lucius. *p.* 464, 465.

Gratian recalls the Confeſſors, and reſtores liberty to the Catholicks in the Eaſt. *p.* 466, 467.

The Macedonians in 378 hold a Council at Antioch in Caria, in which they confirm or renew the ſchiſm: —— Many leave them. *p.* 469, *&c.*

379. Gratian in the year 379 gains a victory in Illyricum, writes to S. Ambroſe, comes to Milan, where he again forbids the aſſemblies of the hereticks by a law of the —— third of Auguſt. *p.* 473.

380. Theodoſius falls ſick, is baptiz'd by Aſcolius of Theſſalonica, and publiſhes a law in favour of the Church —— upon the 28th of February 380. *ibid.*

381. Theodoſius orders upon the 10th of January 381, that all the Churches of the Eaſt poſſeſs'd by the Arians and the other hereticks, ſhould be reſtor'd to the Catholicks. General Sapor executes this law. *p.* 475.

Peter of Alexandria dies probably upon the 14th of February 381: Timothy ſucceeds him. *p.* 476--478.

Theodoſius makes new laws againſt the hereticks —— upon the 19th and 30th of July 381. *p.* 480.

383. A great conference or Council at Conſtantinople in June 383, where Theodoſius aſſembles, as is ſaid, all the ſects to unite them. *p.* 481--484.

S. Amphilochius obtains ſome laws which forbid the hereticks to meet. *p.* 485--488.

384. Theodoſius upon the 21ſt of January 384 orders Cynegius the *Præfectus Prætorio* to turn the Eunomians, Macedonians, Arians, and Apollinarians out of Conſtantinople. *p.* 489.

Theodoſius about 384 baniſhes Eunomius to Halmyris upon the Danube, and from thence to Cæſarea in Cappadocia, from whence he is allow'd to retire to his —— eſtate at Dacora. *p.* 342, 568.

386. Demophilus dying in the year 386, the Arians make Marinus his ſucceſſor, in whoſe place they immediately

A. D.	
386.	after put Dorotheus of Antioch: Marinus forms againſt him the ſect of the Pſathyrians upon a diſpute of the Pithecians and Doulians other Arian ſchiſmaticks. *p.* 490--492.
388.	The law of the tenth of March 388 forbids the hereticks, and particularly the Apollinarians, to hold any congregation, or perform any ordination. *p.* 492,493.
	The Arians burn Nectarius's houſe at Conſtantinople. *p.* 493.
392.	Theodoſius upon the 15th of June 392 lays a fine of ten pounds of gold upon all the Clerks among the hereticks. *ibid.*
396.	Eutropius has the body of Eunomius remov'd to Tyanæ in 396. *p.* 343. The writings and ſtyle of that Arch-heretick. *p.* 343--350.
413.	Innocent I. in the year 413 deſires Aurelius of Carthage to examine in his Council, and ſend him word on what day Eaſter was to be celebrated in the year 414. *p.* 637.

THE

THE INDEX.

A

Aron, an Egyptian Biſhop, baniſh'd in 373 for the faith, &c. *p.* 436.

Abraham, Biſhop of Batnæ, was at Conſtantinople in 381, &c. *p.* 425.

S. *Abraham*, Biſhop of Carræ, ſucceſſor in all likelihood to S. Protogenes. *p.* 424.

S. *Acacius*, Martyr at Conſtantinople under Maximianus Galerius, &c. *p.* 206.

Acacius, whom Baronius thinks was the Arian Prieſt that impos'd upon Conſtantia, Conſtantine, and Conſtantius, *p.* 41, 79, 80, 85, is made Biſhop of Cæſarea in Paleſtine in 340, *p.* 84, may have paſs'd for the tongue of the Arians, *p.* 85, aſſiſts at the Council of Antioch in 341, *p.* 93, is depos'd by that of Sardica in 347, *p.* 121, ordains S. Cyril Biſhop of Jeruſalem in 350 or 351, *p.* 141, is one of the abettors of the intruſion of Felix the Antipope, *p.* 85, 187, depoſes S. Cyril in 358, &c. *p.* 234, &c. is oblig'd to excommunicate Aëtius in 358 or 359, *p.* 213, is preſent at the Council of Antioch after Eudoxius's intruſion, *p.* 240, gets the General Council which Conſtantius had a mind to aſſemble in 358, divided into two, *p.* 255, is preſent at that of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, where he is accus'd, &c. *p.* 289, and appears the Chief of the Anomœans, *p.* 292, requires that S. Cyril ſhould leave the aſſembly, *ibid.* goes out of it himſelf with his party, and proteſts by an act, *p.* 294, preſents a new confeſſion, *p.* 295, is depos'd by it, *p.* 299, encourages Eudoxius, and ſucceeds with the Emperor, *p.* 301, is the ſoul of the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 312, gets the confeſſion of Ariminum ſign'd there, *p.* 314, puts ſeveral Biſhops in the places of thoſe whom he had caus'd to be depos'd there, *p.* 325, chooſes for that purpoſe defenders of the Conſubſtantiality, *p.* 326, is united to the Arians more

more in intereſt than belief, *p.* 307, accuſes Eunomius in the Council of Antioch in 361, *p.* 337, joins S. Meletius, and ſigns the Nicene creed, *p.* 367, joins the Arians again in 365, *p.* 370, is depos'd by the Council of Lampſacus, *p.* 371, and dies ſhortly after, *p.* 372.

Acacius is made Biſhop of Tarſus in 360. *p.* 325.

Acacius ſophiſt of Cæſarea in Paleſtine flouriſh'd about the ſame time. *p.* 372.

Acacius cauſes S. Julian Saba to come to Antioch in 372 to maintain the faith there, *p.* 413, is ſent by the Clergy of Antioch to S. Baſil. *p.* 415.

Aceſius, a Novatian Biſhop, comes to the Council of Nice, *p.* 649, and approves of its decrees, &c. *p.* 650.

S. *Achillas*, Biſhop of Alexandria, advances Arius to the Prieſthood. *p.* 4.

Achillas, Prieſt of Alexandria, a follower of Arius, is anathematiz'd and excommunicated with him by S. Alexander, *p.* 9, 10, retires with him into Paleſtine, *p.* 14, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

S. *Achilles*, Biſhop of Lariſſa, aſſiſts, as is ſaid, at the Council of Nice. *p.* 608.

Acrites, Biſhop of Dioſpontum, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 605.

Adamantius, Biſhop of Cynopolis in Egypt, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 602.

Adelphus, Biſhop of Onuphis in Egypt, baniſh'd for the faith in Conſtantius's reign, *p.* 437, and again in 373. *p.* 436.

Adra, a city in Arabia. *p.* 313.

Adrianople: Conſtantius beheads there in 347 many Catholick Eccleſiaſticks of that church. *p.* 127.

Ægæ, a city of Cilicia. *p.* 612.

Æneas, Biſhop of Ptolomaïs in Phœnicia, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.

Æneas, Biſhop of Gaza about 390. *p.* 138.

The *Aërians*, a branch of the Arians, founded by Aërius. *p.* 221.

The *Aëtians*, a name for the pure Arians. *p.* 218.

Aëtius, Biſhop of Lydda or Dioſpolis, of Arius's party, *p.* 16, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 611, at the depoſition of S. Euſtathius of Antioch in 331, *p.* 45, chooſes in the year 332 Euſebius of Cæſarea to fill the ſee of that Saint. *p.* 49.

Aëtius the atheiſt: The hiſtory of him. *p.* 207, *&c.* He was Paulinus's ſcholar. *p.* 48, 209. Eulalius drives him from Antioch. *p.* 49. Eunomius goes to him to Alexandria in 356. *p.* 332. He returns to Antioch after the intruſion of Eudoxius, &c. *p.* 239, who cannot reſtore him to the Diaconate *p.* 240. The Council of Ancyra in 358 is aſſembled againſt him. *p.* 241. He is accus'd of being an accomplice with Gallus Cæſar in his deſigns, *p.* 246, and is baniſh'd into Phrygia. *p.* 247. His impiety makes Conſtantius reſolve to aſſemble a General Council. *p.* 253. He is excommunicated by the Anomœans themſelves, *p.* 256, 310, goes to Conſtantinople after the Council of Seleucia, *p.* 301, where he owns his blaſphemies before

before Conſtantius, &c. *p.* 304, diſputes with Baſil, and is vanquiſh'd, *p.* 306—309, is depos'd by the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 314, baniſh'd to Mopſueſtia, afterwards to Amblada, &c. *p.* 317. Julian recalls him, writes to him, &c. *p.* 339. He is made a Biſhop, and dies a little after 367, &c. *p.* 339, 340, 365.

Agapius, Biſhop of Seleucia in Iſauria, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 607.

Agapius, Arian Biſhop of Epheſus, forms a party. *p.* 491.

Agathamnon, a Melitian Biſhop in 325, &c. *p.* 633.

Agelius, a Novatian Biſhop at Conſtantinople, avoids the perſecution of Macedonius, *p.* 203, is turn'd out in Valens's reign, afterwards recall'd, &c. *p.* 376, is preſent at the conference of Conſtantinople in 383. *p.* 482.

Aila, an epiſcopal ſee in Paleſtine. *p.* 602.

Aithales, a follower of Arius, is anathematiz'd and excommunicated with him, *p.* 9, 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

Albia. See *Dominica.*

Alexander recover'd from his apoſtaſy by S. Lucian of Antioch the Martyr. *p.* 20.

S. *Alexander* of Alexandria makes Arius a Prieſt or the firſt of his Prieſts, *p.* 4, excommunicates him for his hereſy. *p.* 9. Arius calumniates him, *p.* 15, writes to him &c. *p.* 22, 23. S. Alexander writes ſtrenuouſly againſt him &c. *p.* 26, 28, 29. Whether it was he that made the ſpeech to Conſtantine when he came to the Council of Nice. *p.* 671. He is appointed to publiſh in Egypt the decrees of the Council, *p.* 659, which ſpeaks mightily in his commendation in their letter to the Church of Alexandria. *p.* 657, 658. He demands of Melitius a liſt of his Biſhops, &c. *p.* 633, and is put in poſſeſſion of all the Churches. *p.* 634.

S. *Alexander* of Byzantium or Conſtantinople: S. Alexander of Alexandria writes to him againſt the Arians. *p.* 29. He aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 608, the decrees of which ſynod he is, as is ſaid, appointed to publiſh in the Cyclades, *p.* 660, reſolutely refuſes to receive Arius, *p.* 71, and by his prayers obtains the death of that heretick, *p.* 73, 74, dies the ſame year 336. *p.* 77. His character of Macedonius, &c. *p.* 108.

Alexander of Theſſalonica aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 608, the decrees of which ſynod he is, as is ſaid, appointed to publiſh in Macedonia, &c. *p.* 660, and at the Council of Jeruſalem in 335. *p.* 58.

Alexander, a Novatian, dies in the year 356 of the torments the Arians had made him ſuffer. *p.* 204.

Alexander, an African Biſhop, ſigns the anathema's of the Council of Ancyra at Sirmium in 358. *p.* 244.

Alexander, an Egyptian Biſhop, baniſh'd for the faith in 373. *p.* 436.

Alexandria: The Council of Nice orders the Biſhops of Alexandria to acquaint the Pope with the day on which Eaſter was to be kept, *p.* 637, confirms their juriſdiction over Egypt, Libya,

bya, and Pentapolis. *p.* 640. The dreadful perſecutions which the Catholicks ſuffer there under the Arians. *p.* 197, 429, &c.
Alexandria the leſs, a town of Cilicia. *p.* 603.
Alpheus, or *Alphius*, Biſhop of Apamea in Syria, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice in 325, *p.* 603, and at the election of Euſebius of Cæſarea for the Biſhoprick of Antioch in 332. *p.* 49.
Amantius, an Arian Biſhop, depos'd in the Council of Illyricum in 375. *p.* 445.
Amblada, a town at the foot of mount Taurus. *p.* 317.
S. *Ambroſe* is made Biſhop of Milan in 374, *p.* 444, writes to S. Delphinus and S. Phebadius, *p.* 239, oppoſes the Empreſs Juſtina, who endeavour'd to reſtore Arianiſm. *p.* 490.
Amida, a city of Meſopotamia, is taken by the Perſians in 359. *p.* 267.
Ammon, a follower of Arius, is excommunicated with him, *p.* 11, was a wicked man in many other reſpects, *ibid.* ſigns Arius's letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.
Ammonius, Biſhop of Pacneumonis in Egypt, is baniſh'd for the faith in 373, *p.* 436, had been baniſh'd before in Conſtantius's reign. *p.* 437.
Ammonius, one of the tall brethren, cuts off his ear, that he may not be made a Biſhop. *p.* 438, 478.
Ammonius, a ſolitary at Canopia, takes a journey that he may no longer ſee the outrages of the Arians at Alexandria. *p.* 439.
S. *Amphilochius* is made Biſhop of Iconium in 374, *p.* 444, writes in 376 to ſome Biſhops and Prieſts of Lycia upon the Holy Ghoſt, *p.* 450, aſſiſts perhaps at the conference at Conſtantinople in 383, *p.* 482, artfully obliges Theodoſius to forbid the hereticks to meet. *p.* 485, 592, 593.
S. *Amphion*, Biſhop of Epiphania in Cilicia, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice in 325, *p.* 604, was not tranſlated to Nicomedia. *p.* 670.
Amphion, the Arian Biſhop of Singidunum, unknown; aſſiſts, as Philoſtorgius ſays, at the Council of Nice. *p.* 612.
Amphion is made Biſhop of Nicomedia in 325, &c. *p.* 36, is turn'd out in 328 by Euſebius, *p.* 39, is reſtor'd in 338. *p.* 39, 83. The letter of the Mock-Council of Philippopolis is directed to him. *p.* 122. He was dead in 351. *p.* 143.
Anaſtaſia, Valens's daughter, learns grammar and polite learning of a Novatian. *p.* 376.
Anatolius, or Anthony, of Emiſa in Phœnicia, aſſiſts at the Councils of Nice and Antioch. *p.* 603.
Andronician, a Chriſtian, writes in a Philoſophical manner againſt Eunomius. *p.* 346.
Anianus, Prieſt of Antioch, is made Biſhop of that city in 359, and immediately baniſh'd. *p.* 300. He is heard of no more afterwards. *p.* 351.
Annubian, an Egyptian Biſhop, baniſh'd for the faith in 373. *p.* 436.
Antaradus, a city of Syria. *p.* 89.
Anthony. See *Anatolius*.
Anthony of Tarſus, a pure Arian and Aëtius the Atheiſt's inſtruc tor

tor, *p.* 209, was, as is ſaid, diſciple to S. Lucian of Antioch the Martyr. *p.* 19, 20.
S. *Anthony* cannot prevail with Conſtantine to recall S. Athanaſius. *p.* 77.
Antinoë, a city of Egypt, in Thebaïs prima. *p.* 602.
Antioch: The Council of Nice confirms the juriſdiction and privileges of the Church of Antioch. *p.* 640. Conſtantine begins in 331 to build a magnificent Church there, which is finiſh'd and dedicated in 341. *p.* 93. The promotion of Aëtius to the Diaconate was not the cauſe of the breach of communion between the Catholicks and Arians of Antioch. *p.* 543, 544. The Church there ſuffers very much under Valens. *p.* 409, *&c.*
Antioch, a city of Caria. *p.* 470.
Antiochus, Biſhop of Rheſina, aſſiſts at the Councils of Nice and Antioch. *p.* 603.
Anyſius, a Deacon, writes down the diſpute between Baſil and Photinus in 351. *p.* 146.
Anyſius, an Arian Biſhop, Evippus's diſciple, *p.* 407, puts an uſurper in S. Gregory Nyſſen's place in 376. *p.* 454.
Apamea, a city of Syria. *p.* 603.
S. *Aphraates* the hermit aſſiſts the Church of Antioch againſt Valens in 372, &c. *p.* 410, *&c.*
Aphthonius, a Manichean phyſician, dies being overcome by Aëtius in a diſpute. *p.* 210.
The *Apollinarians* are forbidden to meet by Theodoſius in 383, &c. *p.* 487, 492.
Apollinarius: His hereſy was part of that of Arius's, *p.* 6, ſeems to have been condemn'd in the Council of Illyricum, *p.* 445, is ſo at Rome and Alexandria in 377 or 378. *p.* 466.
Apollonius of Oxyrinchus aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 313.
Arabio, Biſhop of Adra in Arabia, aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 313.
Aradus, an iſland upon the coaſt of Phœnicia. *p.* 418, 419.
Aradus, a city of Syria. *p.* 89.
Arcadius, Arch-Deacon of S. Irene at Conſtantinople, is martyr'd by the Arians in Conſtantius's reign. *p.* 203.
Arcadius the Emperor: S. Amphilochius makes much of him as of a child, to teach Theodoſius, &c. *p.* 486, obtains the pardon of the ſeditious Arians of Conſtantinople in 388, *p.* 493, cauſes all the Eunomian books to be burnt. *p.* 347.
Archaph. See *John.*
Archelaüs of Dolicha aſſiſts at the Councils of Nice and Antioch. *p.* 603.
Ariminum, a town in Romania, &c. *p.* 202.
Ariſtæus, a Grecian Biſhop, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 608.
Arius. See *Macarius.*
Arius: His character. *p.* 1. Envy and ambition engage him in hereſy. *p.* 3. He is condemn'd and excommunicated by S. Alexander, the Clergy of Alexandria, and the Council of Egypt, *p.* 8, 9, goes to Paleſtine with ſome of his followers, *p.* 14, retires to Euſebius of Nicomedia, from whence he writes to S. Alexander, compoſes his Thalia. *p.* 22, *&c.* Con-

ſtantine writes againſt him. *p.* 31, 32. He ſees this prince in the year 324, *p.* 33, 503, is anathematiz'd by the Council of Nice, *p.* 34, 629, where he did not ſign the Conſubſtantiality, *p.* 675, 676, and baniſh'd by Conſtantine in 325, *p.* 34, 629, who writes in preſſing terms againſt him to the church of Alexandria, *p.* 657, afterwards recalls him in 330. *p.* 40--43, 505 — 507. He is receiv'd into the communion of the Church by the Council of Jeruſalem in 335, &c. *p.* 62, 512, 513; but being rejected by the Church of Alexandria, is order'd to Conſtantinople, where he impoſes upon Conſtantine in 336, &c. *p.* 69, &c. His dreadful death. *p.* 73.

Arius, Prieſt of Alexandria, a follower of the Arch-heretick, is excommunicated with him, *p.* 9, 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

Armenia: S. Gregory an Armenian Biſhop obliges his ſucceſſors to be ordain'd by the Biſhop of Cæſarea in Cappadocia. *p.* 605.

Aroſtanus. See *Acrites*.

Arpocratio, Biſhop of Naucratis in Egypt, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, &c. *p.* 602.

Arpocratio, an Egyptian Biſhop, baniſh'd for the faith in 373. *p.* 436.

Arſenius, a Melitian Biſhop, appears after having been ſaid to be murder'd by S. Athanaſius. *p.* 56.

Aſclepas of Gaza aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 602, is depos'd by the Arians in 331, *p.* 45, 508, ſent back to his church in 338, *p.* 82, comes to the Council of Rome in 340, &c. *p.* 87, endeavours to reſtore S. Paul of Conſtantinople after the death of Euſebius. *p.* 108. The Arians throw upon him the guilt of the murders which happen'd at Conſtantinople in 342 upon Macedonius's account. *p.* 111. He is recall'd in 348, and well receiv'd at Gaza. *p.* 136, 137.

Aſclepiades, an Arian Biſhop, depos'd in the Council of Illyricum in 375. *p.* 445.

Aſclepius ſuffers martyrdom for not communicating with the Arians. *p.* 453.

Aſcolius, Biſhop of Theſſalonica, baptizes Theodoſius in 380. *p.* 473.

Aſcolus, Biſhop of Cyzicus, ordains S. Parthenius Biſhop of Lampſacus before 337. *p.* 191.

Aſia is full of Macedonians in 375. *p.* 364, 445.

Aſphalius, Prieſt of Antioch, being ſent by Eudoxius to Conſtantius, &c. *p.* 231, is oppos'd by the deputies of the Council of Ancyra in 356. *p.* 247.

Aſterius, an Arian ſophiſt: A ſhort account of him. *p.* 67. He had been, as is ſaid, diſciple to S. Lucian of Antioch. *p.* 20. It is perhaps he who was call'd the tongue of the Arians. *p.* 85.

S. *Aſterius*, Biſhop of Petra in Arabia, baniſh'd for the faith into the higher Libya in 347. *p.* 129.

Aſterius, an Arian Biſhop, aſſiſts at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, 555, 556, where he is accus'd, *p.* 290, and excommu-

communicated, *p.* 299, is kill'd about 372 by the prayers of S. Julian Saba. *p.* 68, 413, 414.

S. *Aſterius*, diſciple to S. Julian Saba, cauſes him to come to Antioch in 372, to make a declaration of his faith. *p.* 413, 414.

Aſterius, an Arian Prieſt of Antioch, deſires to join the communion of the Eunomians about 381. *p.* 476.

Athanaric, a Gothick Prince, overcomes, as is ſaid, afterwards is overcome by Fritigern, &c. *p.* 461, 586, 587.

Athanaſians, a name which the Arians gave the Catholicks, &c. *p.* 274.

Athanaſius of Anazarbus in Cilicia had been, as is ſaid, diſciple to S. Lucian of Antioch, *p.* 19, follows Arius's errors, *p.* 16, whom he equals in impiety, *p.* 26, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 611. Aëtius reads the Evangeliſts at his houſe. *p.* 209.

Athanaſius, an African Biſhop, ſigns the anathema's of the Council of Ancyra at Sirmium in 348. *p.* 244.

Athanaſius, a great lover of truth, *p.* 207, is made Biſhop of Ancyra in 360, *p.* 325, aſſiſts at the Council of Tyanæ in 367, *p.* 388, was dead perhaps in 373. *p.* 361, 443.

Athanaſius the Arian Biſhop of Scythopolis about 372. *p.* 425.

S. *Athanaſius* goes with S. Alexander to the Council of Nice, *p.* 601, diſputes there againſt Arius, &c. *p.* 619, is, as is ſaid, appointed to publiſh in Egypt the Nicene decrees, *p.* 659, refuſes to receive Arius in 330. *p.* 44. The Arians ſay that he depos'd Aſclepas of Gaza, *p.* 46, perſecute and depoſe him in their Council of Tyre, *p.* 55. Conſtantine baniſhes him into Gaul in 335, *p.* 65. He is recall'd in 338, *p.* 82, aſſiſts at the Council of Rome in 341, *p.* 87, where he is declar'd innocent, *p.* 107, is depos'd at the ſame time by the Council of Antioch, *p.* 95, did not probably ſee Conſtantius before 345. *p.* 113. Theognis counterfeits letters againſt him. *p.* 117. He aſſiſts at the Council of Sardica in 347, *p.* 120, 121, is condemn'd at the ſame time by the Euſebians at Philippopolis, *p.* 123, was at that time in communion with the Biſhops of Lycia and Iſauria. *p.* 126. A guard is plac'd at the gates of Alexandria, for fear he ſhould come again into that city. *p.* 129. Conſtantius recalls him in 348. *p.* 136. He returns to Alexandria in 349. *p.* 138. Conſtantius writes to him, aſſuring him that he need not fear the threats of the Euſebians, &c. *p.* 140, who make an attempt upon the Pope, and ſtir up the Emperor againſt him in 352 and 353. *p.* 150, 151. Liberius ſeparates from him in 357. *p.* 228. They avoid mentioning him at the Council of Ariminum in 359. *p.* 263. He ſeems to have been at Seleucia during the ſeſſion of the Council. *p.* 288. The dreadful conſequences of his abſence. *p.* 329. He returns to Alexandria in Julian's reign. *p.* 359. A ſpurious anſwer of his to a ſpurious letter of Liberius's. *p.* 556. He is perſecuted by Valens in 367, *p.* 389, writes to the Catholick Biſhops, *p.* 390, dies in 373, &c. *p.* 427.

Athas, Biſhop of Schedia in Egypt, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 602.

The *Audæans:* There was not any number of them among the Goths. *p.* 460. They continue to keep Easter with the Jews in Mesopotamia. *p.* 636.

Augarus, Bishop of Cyrus, an Arian, is present, accus'd, and excommunicated in the Council of Seleucia in 359. *p.* 290, 299.

Augustopolis, a city of Phrygia. *p.* 290.

Aurelius of Carthage is consulted by Pope Innocent in 414 about the day upon which Easter was to be kept. *p.* 637.

Auxano, a Novatian, comes along with Acesius to the Council of Nice, &c. *p.* 649, is very much tormented by the Arians. *p.* 204.

Auxentius, Bishop of Mopsuestia, receives and kindly entertains Aëtius who was banish'd thither in 360. *p.* 317. There is all the reason in the world to believe that he was an Arian. *p.* 567, 568.

Auxentius, an Arian, is made Bishop of Milan in 355 in the room of S. Dionysius, *p.* 161, turns S. Martin out of the city of Milan in 356, *p.* 195, goes to the Council of Ariminum in 359, *p.* 262, proposes the third confession of Sirmium there, *p.* 264, and is depos'd there, as is said. *p.* 266, 561. The Semiarians depos'd at Constantinople in 360 write against him. *p.* 322. He is excommunicated by Italy, Spain, and Gaul before 373, &c. *p.* 393, dies in 374. *p.* 444.

Auxentius II, an Arian Bishop of Milan, could not so much as get one single church there. *p.* 490.

Auxonius, the Præfectus Prætorio in 367, banishes Eunomius. *p.* 341, 393.

Axia, an island, may perhaps be that of Naxus. *p.* 341.

B

S. *Babylas*, Bishop of Antioch and Martyr under Decius: His corpse is translated in 352 in Leontius's time who writes the history of him. *p.* 136.

Balanæa, a city of Syria. *p.* 20, 603.

Baptism: Constantine gives the church of Jerusalem rich habits to celebrate that Sacrament in. *p.* 235. Arius dares not change the invocation of the Trinity in the form of Baptism, &c. *p.* 28. Every body naturally abhorrs rebaptization. *p.* 464. The superstition and innovation of the Eunomians in baptism. *p.* 348, 349,

Barca, an episcopal see in Libya. *p.* 612.

S. *Barses*, Bishop of Edessa in Valens's reign: The history of him. *p.* 517. *&c.* His relicks are brought perhaps from the place of his banishment in 378. *p.* 467.

S. *Basil*, Priest of Ancyra, defends the truth perhaps in the Council of Jerusalem in 335. *p.* 58. The Council of Constantinople in 360 forbids him to hold any assembly. *p.* 318. He is martyr'd under Julian. *p.* 58.

Basil, who was made Bishop of Ancyra by the Eusebians in 339, *p.* 66, is excommunicated by the Council of Sardica in 347, 126,

126, is restor'd in 350 by the Eusebians, *p.* 140, assists at the Council of Sirmium against Photinus in 351, *p.* 143, disputes with him, *p.* 146, and with Aëtius the atheist, *p.* 214, 306, 307, against whom he stirs up Gallus Cæsar, *p.* 214, probably favours the intrusion of Felix the Antipope in 355, *p.* 187, 188, was only a Semiarian, *p.* 199, but one of the heads, *p.* 218, 219, condemns the Anomœans in the Council of Ancyra in 358, &c, *p.* 241, is deputed by this Council to go to Constantius &c, *p.* 243, gets the second confession of Sirmium suppress'd, *p.* 245, joins with Eustathius against the Anomœans, *p.* 248, who reproach him with many acts of violence and oppression. *ibid.* Constantius consults him in 358 upon the place where the General Council should meet. *p.* 253---257. He assists at the drawing up of the third confession of Sirmium &c, *p.* 259, which the Acacians assert he sign'd, *p.* 298, he puts down something in writing by way of explication of it, *p.* 259, 260, is present at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, where he is accus'd, *p.* 291, does not go to the first session, *ibid*, is present at the third, *p.* 296, reproves Constantius who makes him hold his tongue, *p.* 303, is depos'd by the Council of Constantinople in 360, *p.* 319, and banish'd into Illyricum, *p.* 321, is alive in Jovian's reign, *p.* 361, to whom he addresses a petition. *p.* 366.

Basil the secretary writes down the dispute between Basil of Ancyra and Photinus in 351. *p.* 146.

S. *Basil*, who was a Reader in 359, refuses to dispute with the Anomœans at Constantinople &c, *p.* 307, 308, dictates some discourses against the hereticks for Eustathius of Sebastia, *p.* 370, supports Eusebius his Bishop against Valens &c, *p.* 377, is made Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia in 370, *p.* 394. A short account of what pass'd between him and Valens in 372. *p.* 407, 408. He refutes Eunomius's apology &c, *p.* 345, comforts the Churches of Antioch, Berea, and Chalcis, *p.* 415, writes in 373 to Peter of Alexandria upon his election, *p.* 428, and to the Church of Alexandria to comfort it. *p.* 442. Some Bishops of Lycia desire to join his communion in 374 or 375. *p.* 470. Isauria embraces it in 375. *p.* 450. Demosthenes makes his Clergy subject to secular offices. *p.* 452. He is threatned with deposition in 376. *p.* 454.

S. *Basileus* of Amasea was not in all likelihood at the Council of Nice. *p.* 605. Philostorgius falsly makes him a follower of Arius. *p.* 612.

Basilicus or *Basil* of Caunus in Lydia is present, accus'd, and excommunicated in the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 290, 299, assists at that of Constantinople in 360. *p.* 313.

Basilides of Gangra seems to have been at the Council of Constantinople in 360. *p.* 314. Eustathius of Sebastia overthrows his altars in 362. *p.* 361. Ecdicius of Parnassus joins in communion with him. *p.* 452.

Bassus of Zeugma assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.

Baucalis, a parish in Alexandria, which Arius had the care of. *p.* 4.

Benig-

Benignus, Biſhop of Heraclea in Macedonia, aſſiſts at the Fifth Council. *p.* 37.

Berea, a city of Syria; The Church there ſuffers a great deal under Valens. *p.* 415. The Council of this city ſhews a great deal of courage in Julian's reign. *ibid.*

Berenice, an epiſcopal ſee in Libya. *p.* 612.

Berytus, a city of Phœnicia. *p.* 17.

Biſhops: The Council of Antioch in 341 makes regulations concerning their election: *p.* 104: That of Illyricum in 375 orders, that they ſhall be taken out of the body of the Clergy, and not out of the officers &c. *p.* 446. Timothy of Alexandria ſays, that he would ordain a good man if his noſe was cut off &c. *p.* 478. The Council of Nice orders, that a Biſhop ſhall be conſecrated by all the Biſhops of his Province, or by three at leaſt, with the conſent of the reſt, and eſpecially of the Metropolitan. *p.* 640. Theophilus, when he was elected Biſhop of Eleutheropolis in Paleſtine, ſwore he would never accept of any other Biſhoprick without the conſent of the Biſhops of Paleſtine. *p.* 320. The Council of Antioch forbids a Biſhop to ſettle a ſucceſſor. *p.* 104: That of Nice to ſettle a Biſhop in the place of a living one, *p.* 646, depoſes Biſhops who were ordain'd after they had been guilty of crimes. *p.* 642. Biſhops gave up their eſtates, when they ſubjected them to ſecular buſineſs. *p.* 320. The Scripture and the Canons forbid them to change their Biſhoprick. *p.* 83, 104, 644. They may however be tranſlated for the good of ſouls. *p.* 453. The Council of Nice forbids them to ordain a Clergyman belonging to another Biſhop: *p.* 644: That of Antioch in 341 to perform any function in another dioceſe. *p.* 103. A Biſhop cannot abſolve a man who is excommunicated by another Biſhop. *p.* 102, 640. The Council of Nice orders, that the Novatians ſhall be receiv'd according to their ſeveral ſtations, and that they ſhall take place as Chorepiſcopi or Prieſts in places where there are Catholick Biſhops. *p.* 650. Some Catholick Biſhops offer the Arians in 378 to govern jointly with them to reſtore harmony to the faith and unity to the people. *p.* 467. The Council of Antioch orders, that a Biſhop depos'd by a ſynod, ſhall not be reſtor'd but by a ſynod, *p.* 95, 102, 103, forbids thoſe who are depos'd to perform any function, under pain of never being reſtor'd, *p.* 102, determines that a Biſhop condemn'd by all the Biſhops of his province, cannot be judg'd by others: *p.* 103: That of Nice does not allow of appealing to the Pope. *p.* 647. S. Paphnutius prevents the Council of Nice from ordering Biſhops to leave their wives. *p.* 649. That Synod allows Biſhops to ſhorten the time of penance &c. *p.* 643. Theodoſius reſerves to them the judgment of eccleſiaſtical affairs. *p.* 479. The Council of Antioch makes regulations about thoſe who refuſe or who cannot take care of their churches, *p.* 103, 104, about the diſpoſal of the goods of the Church. *p.* 104, 105. Princes do themſelves honour by honouring Biſhops &c. *p.* 656. Biſhops ought to diſtinguiſh between what is due to God and what to Cæſar &c. *p.* 446, 447.

Bithynia, infected with the Arians, *p.* 360, 361, and Macedonians. *p.* 364.
Bizya, a town in Thrace. *p.* 396.
The *Bonosiacks*, Photinian hereticks. *p.* 148.
Bonosus, Bishop of Naïssus in the year 381. *p.* 148.
Boræum, an episcopal see in Libya. *p.* 612.
Bosphorus, the old and famous Bishop of Colonia in Cappadocia in 379. *p.* 471.
Bostra, a city of Syria. *p.* 603.
S. *Bretanio*, Bishop of Scythia, maintains the faith against Valens the Emperor in the year 368. *p.* 391, 392.
Bruno, Cardinal Bishop of Segni in the XI or XII century, the author, as is said, of 145 homilies ascrib'd to Eusebius of Emisa. *p.* 98.
The *Burgundians* receive Arianism from the Goths. *p.* 462.
Burial: It was look'd upon as impious to dig up a corpse. *p.* 206.

C

CÆsarea the metropolis of Palestine: *p.* 93: The Council of Nice preserves to the Bishop of Cæsarea the rights of a metropolitan, notwithstanding the privileges of the Church of Jerusalem. *p.* 641.
Cæsarea the metropolis of Cappadocia: *p.* 93: The Bishops of that city ordain, as is said, those of Armenia. *p.* 605.
Cæsarius, the father of Eudoxius, and a pretended Martyr. *p.* 232.
Cæsarius the Prefect has the body of Eunomius remov'd and guarded about 396. *p.* 342, 343.
S. *Cæsarius* of Arles, perhaps the author of some homilies ascribed to Eusebius of Emisa. *p.* 98.
Caius of Thmuis assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 602.
Caius, a Bishop of Illyricum, goes to the Council of Ariminum in 359, *p.* 262, proposes the third confession of Sirmium in that assembly, *p.* 264, is depos'd by it, *p.* 266, is afterwards restor'd, *p.* 272, 274, and sent a deputy to Constantius. *p.* 278. The Semiarians depos'd at Constantinople in 360, write against him, *p.* 322, 323, demand of the Westerns in 366 that they should look upon him as an excommunicate. *p.* 379. He complains of the Ecclesiasticks of Sirmium, *p.* 386, is at last excommunicated by Italy, Spain, and Gaul. *p.* 393.
Calata, a town in Scythia. *p.* 292.
Callicrates the register writes down the dispute between Basil and Photinus in 351. *p.* 146.
Callicrates, Macedonian Bishop of Claudiopolis, presents a petition to Jovian. *p.* 366.
Candidus, an Eunomian Bishop, sent into Lydia and Ionia about the year 363. *p.* 340.
Capito, a Sicilian Bishop, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 608.
Carophrygia, perhaps rather the true name of a country, than a jumble of those of Caria and Phrygia together, *p.* 581.
Carosa, Valens's daughter, learns grammar and polite learning of a Novatian. *p.* 376.

Carpones, Prieſt of Alexandria, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 9, goes with him into Paleſtine, *p.* 14, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.
Carterius, Biſhop of Antaradus, is perſecuted by the Arians about 340. *p.* 89.
Carterius, the head of the Macedonians. *p.* 492.
Caſtabala, a city of Cilicia. *p.* 320, 603.
Cataphronius, Prefect of Egypt, brings George an Arian Biſhop to Alexandria in 356. *p.* 196.
Cathirius or Domnus, Biſhop of Boſphorus, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 610.
Caunus, a city of Lydia. *p.* 290.
Cecilian of Carthage aſſiſts at the Council of Nice in 325, *p.* 601, the decrees of which ſynod he is appointed to publiſh in Africa. *p.* 660. S. Athanaſius gives a character of him very much to his advantage. *p.* 601.
Cecrops, an Arian, ſucceeds Amphion Biſhop of Nicomedia, *p.* 39, aſſiſts in 351 at the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus &c. *p.* 143. George of Laodicea writes to him againſt the Anomœans. *p.* 241. Conſtantius refers to him, as is ſaid, the judgment of Aëtius &c. *p.* 248, 249. He is kill'd by the earthquake in 358. *p.* 254.
Centumcellæ, a town upon the Tuſcan ſea, call'd at preſent Civita-Vecchia. *p.* 179.
Cerealius is preſent at the diſpute between Baſil and Photinus in 361. *p.* 146.
Chæretapa, a city of Phrygia. *p.* 287.
Chalcis, a city of Syria: The Church there ſuffers a great deal under Valens. *p.* 415.
Chares, Prieſt of Mareotis, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 11, whoſe letter to S. Alexander he ſigns. *p.* 23.
Chorepiſcopi, ſometimes call'd Viſitors; *p.* 319, they appointed Readers, Subdeacons, and Exorciſts &c. *p.* 102.
Chreſtus is made Biſhop of Nice in 325 in the room of Theognis, *p.* 36, and diſpoſſeſs'd by Theognis in 328 or 329. *p.* 39.
Chriſtodulus a Deacon, the father of S. Parthenius. *p.* 191.
The *Church*: Her laws are made only for the good of ſouls. *p.* 453. Conſtantius in 360 exempts Church-lands from taxes. *p.* 269.
Civita-Vecchia, formerly Centumcellæ. *p.* 179.
Claudiopolis, a city of Bithynia. *p.* 366.
Claudius, Biſhop of the province of Picenum, aſſiſts at the Council of Ariminum &c. *p.* 277.
Cleopater, an Arian Biſhop, depos'd in the Council of Illyricum in 375. *p.* 445.
Colonia, a city in the leſſer Armenia, p. 453.
Colonia, a city in Cappadocia. *p.* 471.
Confirmation: The Novatians did not give it. *p.* 650.
Conſtans the Emperor continues firm to the Catholick faith, *p.* 82, is not prevail'd upon by the deputies which the Euſebians ſent to him in 342, *p.* 111--113, writes to Conſtantius to call a General Council, *p.* 119, requires him to recall S. Athanaſius &c, *p.* 136, dies in 350. *p.* 139, 140.

Conſtantia, the metropolis of the iſle of Cyprus. *p.* 444.
Conſtantia, Conſtantine the Great's ſiſter, favours Arianiſm, *p.* 18, 628, is impos'd upon by Arius or Euſebius, *p.* 23, by means of an Arian Prieſt whom ſhe recommends to Conſtanſtantine when ſhe lay upon her death-bed. *p.* 41, 42, 507, 508.
Conſtantine the Great, the Emperor, deſpiſes the injuries done to his ſtatues by the ſchiſmaticks, *p.* 30, writes againſt Arius, who endeavours, but in vain, to impoſe upon him in a diſcourſe with him in 324, *p.* 31--33, calls the great Council of Nice, *p.* 596, is preſent at it, *p.* 615--617, leaves the Biſhops entirely to their liberty, *p.* 619, receives their Creed as the work of heaven, *p.* 627, laughs at the ſeverity of the Novatians, *p.* 650, is impos'd upon by Euſebius of Nicomedia, *p.* 628, refuſes to hear the complaints of the Biſhops and burns their petitions, *p.* 654, makes a feaſt for the Biſhops of the Council, and takes his leave of them with a ſpeech, *p.* 658, 659, gives the name of Porphyrians to the Arians, *p.* 630, writes to the Church of Nicomedia and to Theodotus of Laodicea concerning the depoſition and baniſhment of Euſebius and Theognis, *p.* 35, 37, recalls Arius from baniſhment in 330, *p.* 42, propoſes George and Euphronius for the ſee of Antioch in 332, *p.* 50, 51. receives S. Athanaſius's defence, *p.* 55, obliges him to appear at the Council of Tyre in 335, *p.* 56, cauſes a Council to meet at Jeruſalem for the dedication of a Church &c, *p.* 58, ſends Arius thither to be receiv'd into the communion of the Church, *p.* 62, 63, orders S. Athanaſius's adverſaries to come to Conſtantinople, *p.* 65, baniſhes that Saint into Gaul, *ibid*, calls a Council at Conſtantinople in 336, *p.* 70, makes Arius come thither, *p.* 71, will have him receiv'd into the Church, *p.* 73, is angry with S. Alexander who refuſes to do it, *ibid*, acknowledges the vengeance of God on Arius, but not the innocence of the Saints, *p.* 76, baniſhes S. Paul of Conſtantinople ſoon after he was elected, *p.* 77, gives S. Parthenius leave to pull down the temples at Lampſacus, and to build a Church there, *p.* 192, gives S. Macarius of Jeruſalem ſome fine veſtments for the Church &c, *p.* 235, dies in 337, *p.* 78, giving his Will to an Arian Prieſt. *p.* 79. Macedonius removes his corpſe from the Church of the Apoſtles to that of S. Acacius the Martyr. *p.* 206.
Conſtantius the Emperor becomes maſter of the Eaſt in 337. *p.* 78. The idea which the Saints had of his faith and religion. *p.* 78, 79. He is engag'd in Arianiſm, *p.* 79, 80, of which hereſy he is look'd upon as the only ſupport. *p.* 92. An account of his perſecution of the Catholicks. *p.* 162--178. He recalls S. Athanaſius in 338. *p.* 82, puniſhes the city of Conſtantinople for the maſſacre of Hermogenes which happen'd in 342, *p.* 109, 110, has S. Paul turn'd out and Macedonius put in his place, *p.* 110, has Leontius elected Biſhop of Antioch in 348 in the room of Stephen, *p.* 131, is forc'd to recall S. Athanaſius in 348 &c, *p.* 136, renews the perſecution in 350, *p.* 139, 140, receives an account of the appearance of the Croſs at Jeruſalem in 351, *p.* 141, is in quiet poſſeſſion of the whole Em-

pire in 353, *p.* 151, goes to Arles where he does great miſchief to the Church, *p.* 152, baniſhes S. Paulinus of Treves, *p.* 154, 155, publiſhes an impious edict at Milan in 355 &c, *p.* 58, makes an attempt upon Pope Liberius but in vain, *p.* 180--182, has him brought to Milan, *p.* 184, ſends him into baniſhment &c, *p.* 186, obliges Hoſius to come to him to Sirmium in 356, *p.* 196, baniſhes S. Hilary and oppreſſes Thouloufe, *p.* 198, orders the Churches of the Catholicks to be demoliſh'd, *p.* 201, enters Rome in triumph upon the 28th of April 357, *p.* 221, is mock'd and laugh'd at by the people at their publick ſhews, *p.* 222, conſiders about recalling Liberius, *p.* 223, was preſent perhaps at the Council of Sirmium in 357 &c, *p.* 226, to which place he makes Liberius come, *p.* 230, and receives the deputies of the Council of Ancyra in 358 &c. *p.* 244, ſhuts up S. Euſebius the Prieſt at Rome &c, *p.* 251, has a mind to aſſemble a General Council at Nicomedia, afterwards at Nice &c, *p.* 253--258, cauſes a third or fourth confeſſion to be drawn up and ſign'd, *p.* 258--260, calls two Councils at Ariminum and Seleucia, *p.* 261, writes to the firſt, *p.* 263, which he endeavours to tire out by not anſwering their deputies, *p.* 268, whom he makes at laſt yield to his will, *p.* 271, 272, is prepoſſeſs'd by the pure Arians of the Council of Seleucia, *p.* 301, 302, obliges Eudoxius to diſown his own doctrine, *p.* 304, makes the deputies of Seleucia ſign the confeſſion of Ariminum, *p.* 311, baniſhes Aëtius in 360, *p.* 304, 317, makes great preſents to the Church of S. Sophia, *p* 324, conſents to the ordination of Eunomius &c, *p.* 326, 327, whom he cauſes to be depos'd in 361, *p.* 334, 335, aſſembles a Council at Antioch in 361, *p.* 350, 351, baniſhes S. Meletius who had been choſen Biſhop of that city &c, *p.* 352, dies baptiz'd by Euzoïus. *p.* 355.

Conſubſtantial: a term rejected by the Council of Antioch in the ſenſe of Paul of Samoſata, *p.* 244, but eſtabliſh'd by the Council of Nice &c. *p.* 623.

Corniaſpus, a town in Cappadocia. *p.* 331.

Councils: thoſe of Nice and Antioch order two provincial ſynods to be held every year. *p.* 104, 640. That of Nice allows a Council to examine what has been determin'd by a preceding one. *p.* 645. There is a commemoration of the Council of Nice. *p.* 661.

Councils of the Catholicks which are taken notice of in this hiſtory: at Nice in 325, *p.* 595, &c, one at Rome, as is ſaid, to confirm that of Nice, *p.* 660, at Rome in 34[illegible] under S. Julius, *p.* 87, 91, 107. The authority of the Canons of the Council of Antioch in 341, *p.* 105, 106. At Milan in 345, *p.* 119, at Cologn in 346, very uncertain, *p.* 120, 530--534, at Sardica in 347, *p.* 120, at Corduba in oppoſition to the Mock-Council of Philippopolis, *p.* 125, at Milan againſt Photinus, *p.* 129, at Sirmium in 349 againſt Photinus, *p.* 138, 139, at Ariminum in 359, which was Catholick at the beginning of it. *p.* 264--269. A great number of Councils are held in Julian's reign. *p.* 360. At Tyanæ in 367, *p.* 387, at Rome in 369, *p.* 393, in Illyricum in 375, *p.* 444, at Laodicea in Phrygia before 381, *p.* 449, at Conſtantinople in 383. *p.* 481.

Councils

Councils of the Arians, Semiarians, and Macedonians: in Bithynia, *p.* 25, and in Paleſtine for Arius, *p.* 28, at Antioch againſt S. Euſtathius in 331, *p.* 45, at Cæſarea in Paleſtine in 334, *p.* 56, at Tyre and Jeruſalem in 335, *p.* 57, at Conſtantinople in 336 againſt Marcellus of Ancyra, *p.* 66, 69, at Antioch in 341 for the dedication of the Church, *p.* 93, at Philippopolis in 347, *p.* 121, at Sirmium in 351 againſt Photinus, *p.* 143, at Arles in 353, *p.* 152, at Milan in 355, *p.* 157, at Antioch in 356, *p.* 197, at Sirmium in 357, *p.* 226, at Antioch after Eudoxius's intruſion, *p.* 240, at Ancyra in 358 againſt the Anomœans, *p.* 241, at Ariminum, at Seleucia in Iſauria, and at Nicæ in Thrace in 359, *p.* 279, 286, &c, at Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 312, at Antioch in 361, *p.* 350, 353, at Zela in Pontus, *p.* 362, at Lampſacus in 365, *p.* 370, at Nicomedia in 366, *p.* 370, at Antioch in Caria in 367, *p.* 389, at Ancyra in 375, *p.* 451, at Cyzicus in 376, *p.* 454. A liſt of all their confeſſions. *p.* 355.

Creſcens, an African Biſhop, ſigns the anathema's of the Council of Ancyra at Sirmium in 358. *p.* 244.

Criſpin diſciple and writer of the hiſtory of S. Parthenius Biſhop of Lampſacus &c. *p.* 189.

Criſpinus, an Arian Prieſt of Antioch, deſires to join the communion of the Eunomians about 381. *p.* 476.

Croſs: an appearance of it at Jeruſalem in 351. *p.* 141.

Curcians, Arians call'd ſo becauſe of one Curcius. *p.* 491.

Cymatius of Paltus and *Cymatius* of Aradus in Syria, perſecuted by the Arians about 340 &c. *p.* 89.

Cynegius Præfectus Prætorio in 384. *p.* 489.

Cyno, an Egyptian Biſhop, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 602.

Cynopolis, a city in Arcadia and Ægyptus ſecunda. *p.* 602.

S. *Cyriachus* or *Cyril*, Biſhop of Paphos, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 607.

Cyril, a Biſhop in the leſſer Armenia about 366. *p.* 380.

S. *Cyril* is made Biſhop of Jeruſalem in 350 or 351, *p.* 54, 141, gives an account to Conſtantius of the appearance of the Croſs, *p.* 141, is depos'd and turn'd out by Acacius of Cæſarea in 358 &c, *p.* 234, retires to Silvanus of Tarſus, *p.* 236, aſſiſts at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, where he accuſes Acacius &c, *p.* 289, and is likewiſe accus'd, *p.* 290, is reſtor'd by this Council. *p.* 300. The Acacians calumniate him to Conſtantius. *p.* 302. He is depos'd by the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 321, is reſtor'd to the poſſeſſion of his Church in Julian's reign, *p.* 359, is perhaps nam'd in Liberius's letter in 366, *p.* 380, makes Philumenus, afterwards Gelaſius his nephew, Biſhop of Cæſarea in Paleſtine. *p.* 426. His Church was govern'd in 376 by one Hilario who was in communion with the Arians. *p.* 425, 426. He is reſtor'd to his ſee in 379. *p.* 468.

Cyril the Old, is made Biſhop of Cæſarea in Paleſtine by the Arians. *p.* 426.

Cyrio of Philadelphia aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.

Cyrio, Biſhop of Dolicha, aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 313.

Cyrus, a city of Syria. *p.* 603.
Cyrus, Biſhop of Berea, perſecuted by the Arians about 340 &c. *p.* 89.
Cyzicus, a city of Helleſpont. *p.* 334. The people there openly oppoſe Eunomius's blaſphemies. *p.* 333. There was a great number of Macedonians in that city. *p.* 364, 374.

D

Dacidiſus, a port upon the coaſt of Bithynia. *p.* 397.
Dacora, the eſtate rather than the village of Eunomius. *p.* 331.
Dacus of Berenice, an Arian, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 612.
Damaſus, Liberius's Deacon, accompanies him in 355, when he went into baniſhment. *p.* 187. There are no proofs of his having communicated with the Antipope Felix. *p.* 541, 563. He was, as is ſaid, a Prieſt and Vicar General to Liberius in 359 or 360, *p.* 285, ſucceeds him in 366, *p.* 384, holds a Council at Rome in 369 &c, *p.* 393. Theodoſius in 380 orders his ſubjects to follow the faith taught by Damaſus. *p.* 473. They make him ordain S. Gaudentius, *p.* 564.
Datianus is preſent at the diſpute between Baſil and Photinus in 351. *p.* 146.
Deaconeſſes: It is difficult to underſtand the addition of the nineteenth Canon of Nice which relates to them. *p.* 685, 686.
Deacons: The Council of Antioch in 341 allows them to ſuperviſe the adminiſtration of the goods of the Church. *p.* 105. Some Deacons ſign for their Biſhops in the Council of Seleucia. *p.* 294. The Council of Nice forbids them to leave their Churches, *p.* 644, to give the Euchariſt to Prieſts, to ſit among them &c. *ibid.*
S. *Delphinus* Biſhop of Bourdeaux: S. Ambroſe writes to him. *p.* 239.
Demophilus, Biſhop of Berea, carries to the Weſterns in 345 a new creed of the Euſebians, *p.* 118, aſſiſts at the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus in 351, *p.* 143, propoſes the third confeſſion of Sirmium to the Council of Ariminum in 359, *p.* 264, 560, 561, where he is depos'd, as is ſaid. *p.* 266, 561. Aëtius makes him an abettor of his blaſphemies. *p.* 309. He aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 313, makes himſelf Biſhop of Conſtantinople in 370 &c, *p.* 398, 578, 579, places a Biſhop at Cyzicus, *p.* 400, is turn'd out of Conſtantinople in 380 &c, *p.* 474, near which city he lives, *p.* 589, is there at the conference in 383, *p.* 482, dies in 386, *p.* 490.
Demoſthenes, the Lieutenant in Pontus, baniſhes S. Gregory Nyſſen about 375, *p.* 415, perſecutes Cappadocia and the neighbouring provinces. *p.* 451--454.
Dianius of Cæſarea in Cappadocia aſſiſts at the Council of Antioch in 341, *p.* 93, upon which occaſion the moſt that can be done for him is to alleviate his crime, *p.* 106, he excuſes himſelf with the Euſebians for not coming to the Council of Rome, *p.* 107, ſigns the confeſſion of Ariminum, *p.* 329.

Dicaſius of Tabia in Galatia aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 606.
Didierus of Campania: The Mock-Council of Philoppopolis in 347 directs their letter to him. *p.* 122.
Didymus writes againſt Eunomius. *p.* 346.
Die, a city of Dauphiny &c. *p.* 609.
Digne, a city of Provence. *p.* 609.
Diocæſarea, a town in Paleſtine, deſtroy'd in 352 upon the account of the revolt of the Jews. *p.* 436.
Diodorus, an Aſian Biſhop, perſecuted by the Arians about 340, *p.* 89, baniſh'd about 347. *p.* 128.
Diodorus, a laick, ſupports and animates the Catholicks of Antioch &c, *p.* 133, obliges Leontius to depoſe Aëtius about 350, *p.* 212, 213, continues when a Prieſt to ſupport the Church againſt Valens, *p.* 409, is baniſh'd and perſecuted, *p.* 414, is made Biſhop of Tarſus in 379. *p* 443, 468.
Diogenes, Prieſt of Alexandria, us'd ill by Baſil of Ancyra. *p.* 248, 319.
Dionyſiopolis, a city of Scythia. *p.* 392.
Dionyſius, Count, uſes S. Athanaſius very ill at the Council of Tyre in 335 *p.* 56.
S. *Dionyſius*, Biſhop of Milan, is baniſh'd in 355, and dies in exile, *p.* 158, 161, perhaps before the Council of Seleucia in 359. *p.* 288.
Dionyſius, Biſhop of Dioſpolis and Confeſſor. *p.* 425.
Dionyſius, Abbot of Rhinocurura in Egypt. *p.* 440.
Dioſcorus, Biſhop of Hermopolis the leſs after 391. *p.* 437.
Dioſpolis or Lydda, a city of Paleſtine. *p.* 16.
Dioſpontum, a city in the greater Armenia. *p.* 605.
Doara, a market-town, an epiſcopal ſee in Cappadocia ſecunda. *p.* 454.
Dolicha, a city of Syria. *p.* 603.
Dominica (Albia) Valens's wife, engages him in Arianiſm, *p.* 368, perſuades him to be baptiz'd by Eudoxius. *p.* 390, 391.
Domitian the Prefect put to death by Gallus in 354. *p.* 215.
S. *Domninus* preaches the faith at Digne probably after 350, *p.* 609.
Domninus of Marcianople prevails that Eunomius may be recall'd about 368. *p.* 341, 393.
Domnio of Sirmium, perſecuted by the Arians about 340. *p.* 89.
Domnus or Cathirius, Biſhop of Boſphorus, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 609.
Donatus the Proconſul receives orders againſt Olympius of Enos about 340. *p.* 90.
S. *Dorotheus* Biſhop of Tyre in Diocleſian's reign. *p.* 439.
Dorotheus, a Prieſt, accuſes Patrophilus of Scythopolis in the Council of Seleucia in 359. *p.* 289.
S. *Dorotheus* martyr'd at Alexandria perhaps in 375. *p.* 439.
Dorotheus, a Prieſt, deputed in 375 by S. Baſil &c. *p.* 448.
Dorotheus, the Arian Biſhop of Heraclea, ſometimes call'd Theodorus, *p.* 457, 580, inſtalls Demophilus in the ſee of Conſtantinople in 370, *p.* 399, joins with him in placing a Biſhop at Cyzicus, *p.* 400, ſucceeds Euzoïus of Antioch in 376, *p.* 457, keeps

keeps poſſeſſion of the Churches there for the Arians in 379, *p.* 468, retires into Thrace in 381, *p.* 476, 487, is recall'd to Conſtantinople by the Arians in 386, to be their Biſhop there, *p.* 490, which cauſes a ſchiſm betwixt him and Marinus that laſts 35 years. *p.* 593.

Dracontius of Pergamus is depos'd by the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 320.

Dracontius, Biſhop of Hermopolis the leſs before 367. *p.* 437.

Dulcidius, Biſhop of Agen. *p.* 239.

E

Eaſter: The Councils of Nice and Antioch order that this feſtival ſhall be obſery'd every where upon the ſame day. *p.* 101, 635. That of Nice orders that people ſhall pray ſtanding all the time of Eaſter. *p.* 645. What is the meaning of faſting upon the firſt Eaſter. *p.* 679—681.

Eccleſiaſticks: The Council of Nice places thoſe who are mutilated and the bigamiſts upon the ſame foot. *p.* 639, 646. Innocent I. joins to them thoſe that go to the wars, plead, &c. after their baptiſm. *p.* 686. The Council of Nice depoſes thoſe who were ordain'd after they had been guilty of crimes, *p.* 642, forbids the ordination of thoſe who are newly baptiz'd. *p.* 639. Eccleſiaſticks had marks of their office, *p.* 101, took place from the day of their ordination, &c. *p.* 632, 679. The Councils of Nice and Antioch oblige them to continue where they were ordain'd, &c. *p.* 102, 644. S. Paphnutius prevents the Council of Nice from ordering them to leave their wives, &c. *p.* 649. That Synod does not allow them to have any in their houſes but their neareſt relations. *p.* 639. The Council of Antioch forbids them to go to Court without the permiſſion of their Biſhops, &c. *p.* 103, depoſes without any hopes of reſtoration thoſe who peform their functions when depos'd by their Biſhops, &c. *p.* 102. The Council of Nice does not allow them to appeal to the Pope. *p.* 647. The Chorepiſcopi might appoint Readers, Subdeacons, and Exorciſts, but not ordain Deacons or Prieſts. *p.* 102. The Eccleſiaſticks of Rhinocurura in Egypt liv'd in common about 370. *p.* 440, 441.

Ecdicius intrudes into the Church of Parnaſſus in 375, *p.* 451, places an uſurper in S. Gregory Nyſſen's place in 376. *p.* 454.

Edeſſa, the metropolis of Oſrhoena, *p.* 418, the couragious piety of its inhabitants. *p.* 420, 421.

Egypt is troubled with the Arians in Valens's reign. *p.* 430—442. An encomium upon the Church of Egypt by S. Gregory Nazianzen. *p.* 441.

Eleuſius is made Biſhop of Cyzicus about 356, *p.* 201, is one of the heads of the Semiarians, *p.* 199, 220, deſtroys the Church of the Novatians at Cyzicus, *p.* 205, aſſiſts at the Council of Ancyra in 358, *p.* 242, which deputes him to Conſtantius, *p.* 243, is preſent at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, where he rejects the confeſſion of the Acacians, *p.* 297, 298, is deputed by that Council to Conſtantius, *p.* 300, to whom he preſents the blaſphemies of Eudoxius, *p.* 303, is depos'd by

by the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 319. Macedonius writes to him. *p.* 322. He is turn'd out and Eunomius put in his place, *p.* 326, 327, is reſtor'd to the poſſeſſion of his Church in Julian's reign, *p.* 361, is preſent at the Council of Lampſacus in 365, *p.* 371, ſubmits to the Arian Council of Nicomedia in 366, *p.* 374, is not nam'd in Liberius's letter in 366, *p.* 380, is preſent at the General Council of Conſtantinople in 381, *p.* 479, and at the conference of 383. *p.* 482. He was regular in his morals. *p.* 363. Theodorit commends him too much. *p.* 306.

Eleutheropolis, a city of Paleſtine. *p.* 602.

Elpidius, Prieſt of Rome, being ſent into the Eaſt to ſummon the Euſebians to the Council of Rome in 341, *p.* 87, is kept by them beyond the appointed time, &c. *p.* 107.

Elpidius, Biſhop of Satala, ſigns the letter from the deputies of the Council of Seleucia to thoſe of Ariminum, *p.* 310, is depos'd by the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, &c. *p.* 320, is perhaps nam'd in Liberius's letter in 366. *p.* 380.

Elpidius, a Prieſt, carries letters from Valentinian and the Council of Illyricum into Aſia in 375, *p.* 446, was ſent by the Emperor rather than the Pope. *p.* 583.

Elpidius is made Biſhop of Laodicea between 381 and 398. *p.* 417.

Emiſa, a city of Phœnicia near mount Libanus, &c. *p.* 96, 603.

The *Emperors* publiſh'd their particular orders with the names of their collegues. *p.* 447.

Enos, a town in Thrace. *p.* 90.

Eortaſius, Biſhop of Sardis, ſigns the letter from the deputies of the Council of Seleucia to thoſe of Ariminum, *p.* 310, is depos'd by the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 320, is nam'd in Liberius's letter in 366. *p.* 380.

Epictetus, the Arian Biſhop of Centumcellæ in 355, is in favour with Conſtantius, &c. *p.* 179, is preſent at the conference between Liberius and Conſtantius at Milan, *p.* 185, abets the intruſion of Felix the Antipope, *p.* 187, kills S. Rufinian Biſhop of Campania, *p.* 195, goes to the Council of Ariminum in 359, *p.* 262, is call'd in the letter one of the firſt prevaricators. *p.* 273.

Epiphania, a city in Syria. *p.* 290.

Epiphania, a city in Cilicia. *p.* 604.

S. *Epiphanius* writes his Ancoratus for the Church of Suedra in 374. *p.* 444.

Erecius of Placia or Plata in Galatia aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 606.

Eremus of Theſſalonica abandons S. Athanaſius's cauſe in the Council of Milan in 355. *p.* 159.

Etherius of Edeſſa aſſiſts at the Councils of Nice and Antioch. *p.* 603.

Evagrius, Biſhop of Mitylene, is preſent and accus'd at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 289, is depos'd there, *p.* 299, aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 313.

S. *Evagrius* is elected Biſhop of Conſtantinople in 370, and baniſh'd immediately. *p.* 395, 396.

Euanthius is present at the dispute between Basil and Photinus in 351. *p.* 146.

Eucharist: The Council of Nice orders it to be given to all who demand it at the point of death. *p.* 643, 684, 685. That of Antioch lays all those under penance who refuse to receive it with the rest. *p.* 101. The Arians put it by force into the mouths of the Novatians. *p.* 204. Some Councils of Carthage forbid it to be celebrated after dinner. *p.* 686.

S. *Eucherius* Bishop of Lions, perhaps the author of some homilies ascrib'd to Eusebius of Emisa. *p.* 98.

Eudoxius, disciple, as is said, of S. Lucian of Antioch. *p.* 19. An account of him. *p.* 232, 549. He could not get himself receiv'd among the Clergy by S. Eustathius, *p.* 45, is made Bishop of Germanicia by the Eusebians, *p.* 52, assists at the Council of Antioch in 341, *p.* 93, carries to the Westerns in 345 a new creed of the Eusebians, *p.* 118, assists in 351 at the Council of Sirmium. *p.* 143. Eunomius comes with Aëtius to see him. *p.* 332. He is oblig'd to excommunicate Aëtius in 358, *p.* 213, seizes upon the see of Antioch, *p.* 231, maintains heresy publickly, *p.* 239, is condemn'd by the Council of Ancyra, *p.* 241, 242, being turn'd out of Antioch retires into Armenia, *p.* 247, is recall'd and regarded as a teacher of the truth by Constantius, *p.* 256, gets the General Council of the year 359 divided into two, *p.* 255, assists at that of Seleucia, *p.* 287, where he is accus'd, *p.* 289, and depos'd, *p.* 299, is encourag'd by Acacius, *p.* 301, is oblig'd by Constantius to condemn his own principles, *p.* 304, defends the tenet of the Anomœans against Basil. *p.* 307. Aëtius accuses him of being of the same principles with him. *p.* 309. He assists at the Council of Constantinople in 360. *p.* 312. The depos'd Bishops write against him. *p.* 321. He seizes upon the see of Constantinople, *p.* 323, and publishes his impiety there, *p.* 324, endeavours to propagate the doctrine of Aëtius, *p.* 326, makes Eunomius Bishop of Cyzicus, *p.* 332, 375, is oblig'd to depose him in 361, *p.* 335, gives him an opportunity of vindicating himself, *p.* 336, advises him to return to Cyzicus, *ibid*, declares against the Arians in 364, *p.* 340, refuses to appear before the Council of Lampsacus in 365, *p.* 371, sets Valens against the Macedonians, *p.* 373, prevents the Council of Tarsus from meeting in 367, *p.* 389, baptizes Valens, *p.* 391, hinders him from seeing Eunomius, *p.* 341, 393, dies in 370, &c. *p.* 341, 395.

Evethus, nam'd in Liberius's letter in 366, perhaps Hypatian or Hypsius. *p.* 379, 380.

Eugenius, a governor of the hospitals of Antioch about 350. *p.* 135.

Eugenius, Bishop of Nice: George of Laodicea writes to him in 358 against the Anomœans. *p.* 241. He assists perhaps at the Council of Constatinople in 360, *p.* 314, dies in 370. *p.* 395.

Evippus, Bishop perhaps of Galatia, assists at the Council of Constantinople in 360. *p.* 314. The Bishops depos'd in that Council write against him. *p.* 321. He goes in 371 to Cæsarea in Cappadocia to oppose the Catholicks there, &c. *p.* 406.

Eulalius,

Eulalius, an Arian Bishop of Cappadocia, or of Sebastia in Armenia, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 612.

Eulalius, call'd likewise Valerius, is made Bishop of Antioch in 331, drives Aëtius from thence, and dies shortly after. *p.* 49, 209, 509.

Eulalius is made Bishop of Doara in Cappadocia secunda about 373. *p.* 454.

Eulalius, Bishop of Amasea, is banish'd by the Arians in Valens's reign, *p.* 408, reurns in 378, and unites his whole Church. *p.* 467.

Eulogius, a philosopher, converted by an holy confessor at the Council of Nice. *p.* 651 —— 653.

S. *Eulogius*, Bishop of Edessa: The history of him. *p.* 421--424.

Eulogius an Egyptian Bishop, banish'd in Constantius's reign for the faith, *p.* 437, is banish'd again in 373. *p.* 436.

The *Eunomians*, pure Arians, *p.* 218, are forbidden the free exercise of their religion. *p.* 342, 466, 475, 487.

Eunomius is made Bishop of Samosata by the Arians in 374, but retires. *p.* 444.

Eunomius: The history of him. *p.* 330 --- 350. He lists himself a disciple to Aëtius's impiety. *p.* 216. Eudoxius ordains him Deacon, and sends him to Constantius who banishes him into Phrygia in 358. *p.* 247. He goes to Constantinople after the Council of Seleucia, *p.* 301, is chosen there one of the defenders of the doctrine of the Anomœans, *p.* 307, is made Bishop of Cyzicus in 360. *p.* 327, 332. The Arians of Antioch desire to join his communion in 381, &c. *p.* 476. He assists at the conference at Constantinople in 383, *p.* 482, where he gives in his profession of faith. *p.* 484. S. Flaccilla prevents Theodosius's seeing him. *p.* 485. He is banish'd between 383 and 386. *p.* 342, 488, 568.

Eunuchs who have mutilated themselves, are excluded out of the number of the Clergy by the Council of Nice. *p.* 639.

Euphrates, Bishop of Egypt, banish'd for the faith in 373. *p.* 436.

Euphrates, Bishop of Cologn, is depos'd, as is said, in 346, *p.* 120, which is very difficult to believe, *p.* 530 --- 534, is sent in 348 by Constans and the Council of Sardica to Constantius. *p.* 131, 136.

Euphratio, Bishop of Balanæa in Syria: Eusebius of Cæsarea writes the greatest blasphemies to him. *p.* 26. He assists at the Council of Nice, *p.* 603, is persecuted by the Arians. *p.* 89.

Euphronius, Priest of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, is made Bishop of Antioch in 332, and dies in 333. *p.* 51, 509.

Euphronius, Bishop of Colonia in the lesser Armenia, is translated to Nicopolis about 376. *p.* 453.

Eupsychius, Bishop of Tyanæ, assists at the Council of Nice, *p.* 605, disputes there, as is said, against a philosopher. *p.* 653.

Eusebia the Empress devoted to Arianism. *p.* 81.

The *Eusebians*, call'd so upon the account of Eusebius of Nicomedia their Chief, were those who communicated with the first Arians, and in 355 openly appear'd Arians, *p.* 12, 160, 161, divide into many sects after 357. *p.* 217.

Euſebius, Biſhop of Cæſarea in Paleſtine: Arius boaſts of having him in his belief. *p.* 16. The impieties of his letter to Euphratio. *p.* 26. He authorizes Arius's ſchiſm. *p.* 28. He aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 611, is not probably the Biſhop that made the ſpeech to Conſtantine upon his coming into the Council. *p.* 671. The VII. Council calls him the chief of the enemies of the Council of Nice, *p.* 625, 626, which he ſigns, but with hypocriſy, *p.* 626, the decrees of which ſynod he is, as is ſaid, appointed to publiſh in Paleſtine, &c. *p.* 659, pronounces there a panegyrick upon Conſtantine upon his entring into the twentieth year of his reign, *p.* 658, diſputes there, as is ſaid, againſt a philoſopher. *p.* 653. The Golden number is attributed to him, &c. *p.* 638. S. Euſtathius of Antioch accuſes him of violating the Nicene faith, &c. *p.* 45. He aſſiſts at the depoſition of that Saint in 331, *ibid*, refuſes the biſhoprick of Antioch in 332, *p.* 50, 509, 510, praiſes Euſebius of Nicomedia for his tranſlations, *p.* 19, extols the Council of Jeruſalem at which he aſſiſts in 335, to eclipſe that of Nice, *p.* 58, goes to Conſtantine to oppoſe S. Athanaſius, *p.* 65, is preſent at the Council of Conſtantinople in 336, *p.* 69, dies in 338. *p.* 84. Acacius his ſucceſſor writes his life. *ibid.*

Euſebius, Biſhop of Berytus, might be related to Conſtantine, *p.* 18, as he was to Julian the apoſtate, *p.* 501, is tranſlated from Berytus to Nicomedia, *p.* 17, ſeems to have been rather Arius's maſter than his diſciple, *p.* 20 --- 22, whom he receives into his houſe, and for whom he writes to S. Alexander of Alexandria. *p.* 22. He gets Arius receiv'd in the Council of Bithynia, writes to the Biſhops in his behalf, *p.* 25, 26, protects the Melitians with a deſign to make them receive Arius, *p.* 35, ſhews himſelf the protector of Arius and a follower of his blaſphemies in the Council of Nice, *p.* 620, which he ſigns againſt his will, and where he impoſes upon Conſtantine and gets his protection, *p.* 627, 628, perſiſts in his impiety after the Council of Nice, *p.* 34, continues to defend and ſupport the Arians who had been condemn'd there, *p.* 35, is depos'd and baniſh'd, &c. *p.* 35, 36, 503 -- 505; his petition to the Council in all likelihood a ſpurious piece. *p.* 672--675. He is recall'd in 328 or 329, *p.* 38, 39, depoſes S. Euſtathius of Antioch, and gets him baniſh'd in 331, *p.* 45, turns out S. Eutropius of Adrianople, &c. *p.* 52, raiſes ſeveral calumnies upon S. Athanaſius, *p.* 55, and depoſes him at Tyre, *p.* 57, goes to the Council of Jeruſalem in 335, *p.* 58, comes in 336 to Conſtantinople to oppoſe S. Athanaſius, *p.* 64, 65, endeavours in vain to get Arius receiv'd by S. Alexander, *p.* 71, cauſes S. Paul of Conſtantinople to be depos'd in 336, *p.* 77, continues to miſrepreſent the Saints to Conſtantius, *p.* 80, uſurps the ſee of Conſtantinople in 338 or 339, *p.* 83, excommunicates Euſtathius of Sebaſtia, *p.* 320, aſſiſts at the Council of Antioch in 341, *p.* 93, from whence he ſends back the legates of Rome with a letter to the Pope, *p.* 107, and dies ſhortly after. *ibid.*

S. *Euſebius*, Prieſt of Rome, martyr'd, as is ſaid, in Conſtantius's reign. *p.* 251. Difficulties relating to the hiſtory of him. *p.* 552--554.

Euſebius, Biſhop of Emiſa: The hiſtory of him. *p.* 95--97.
Euſebius of Emiſa, ſurnam'd Pittacus, perhaps a lawyer, is put to death in 354. *p.* 524, 525.
Euſebius, a Prieſt, depos'd in the Council of Melitene. *p.* 320.
Euſebius, a Biſhop, accus'd and excommunicated by the Council of Seleucia in 359. *p.* 299.
Euſebius of Seleucia in Syria aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 313.
Euſebius, Conſtantius's Great Chamberlain, is gain'd by the Arians, &c. *p.* 80, makes an attempt upon Pope Liberius in 355, but in vain, &c. *p.* 180, is preſent at the conference between this Pope and Conſtantius at Milan. *p.* 185. Liberius refuſes his preſents. *p.* 187. He reſtores the Anomœans to Conſtantius's favour, *p.* 255, 256, is put to death by Julian. *p.* 358.
S. *Euſebius* of Vercellæ receives a letter from Liberius in 354, &c. *p.* 156, is baniſh'd in 355, &c. *p.* 158, commends Gregory of Eliberis for ſeparating from the prevaricators of Arminum, *p.* 281, 283, 284, is recall'd in Julian's reign. *p.* 359.
Euſebius of Cæſarea in Cappadocia defends the truth againſt Valens, &c. *p.* 377, is preſent at the Council of Tyanæ in 367. *p.* 388.
S. *Euſebius*, Biſhop of Samoſata, who had the inſtrument of S. Meletius's election in 361 depoſited in his hands, refuſes to return it, *p.* 351, 352, ordains S. Eulogius Biſhop of Edeſſa, *p.* 424, is baniſh'd into Thrace in 374, *p.* 444, and martyr'd by the hereticks in 380. *p.* 467.
Euſtaſius ſupported and defended by Hoſius. *p.* 124.
S. *Euſtathius*, Biſhop of Antioch, refuſes to receive George, Eudoxius, Leontius, &c. into his Clergy, *p.* 27, 45, 51, 131, 232, might poſſibly preſide in the Council of Nice, and make the ſpeech to Conſtantine there, *p.* 600, 671, diſputes there, as is ſaid, againſt a philoſopher, *p.* 655, is appointed to publiſh the decrees of that ſynod in Syria, &c. *p.* 659, is depos'd by the Euſebians in 331, and baniſh'd. *p.* 44, 45. Hoſius defends him, &c. *p.* 124.
Euſtathius, Biſhop of Parion, is at S. Parthenius's funeral before 360. *p.* 193.
Euſtathius of Epiphania or of Pinaræ is accus'd and excommunicated by the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 290, 299, aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 313.
S. *Euſtathius* inſtalls or ordains S. Evagrius Biſhop of Conſtantinople in 370, and is baniſh'd upon that account. *p.* 395, 396.
Euſtathius, a Biſhop of Illyricum, repreſents there the diſmal condition of the Church of Aſia in 375, &c. *p.* 445, 576, 577.
Euſtathius, afterwards one of the heads of the Semiarians, *p.* 220, cannot be receiv'd into the Clergy of Antioch under S. Euſtathius, *p.* 45, is made Biſhop of Sebaſtia, *p.* 52. It is probable he gave ſome lectures to Aëtius, *p.* 210, who confounds him, as is ſaid, in a diſpute. *p.* 214. He ſtirs up Gallus againſt Aëtius, &c. *ibid.* continues in communion with S. Cyril of Jeruſalem, &c. *p.* 236, is preſent at the Council of Ancyra in 358, *p.* 242, which ſends him to Conſtantius, &c. *p.* 243, joins with Baſil againſt the Anomœans, *p.* 248, is

present at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, where he is accus'd, *p.* 290, and sent on a deputation to Constantius, *p.* 300, makes Eudoxius anathematize Aëtius's blasphemies, *p.* 304, disputes against the Anomœans at Constantinople, *p.* 307, is depos'd by the Council of Constantinople in 360, *p.* 319, and styl'd an enemy to the Council of Melitene, *p.* 321, is banish'd into Dardania, *ibid*, and recall'd in Julian's reign, *p.* 362, assists at the Council of Lampsacus in 365 &c, *p.* 370, afterwards signs the confession of Nicæ, *p.* 376, is sent on a deputation to Liberius, *p.* 379--390, breaks with S. Basil in 373, *p.* 443, makes Ecdicius Bishop of Parnassus, *p.* 451, communicates in private with the Arians assembled at Ancyra in 375, *ibid*, cannot obtain to be admitted publickly to their communion, *p.* 453, signs a new profession of faith at Cyzicus, *p.* 454. He was regular in his morals. *p.* 363. Theodorit extols him very much, but is wrong in doing so. *p.* 306.

Eustolia, a woman corrupted by Leontius of Antioch. *p.* 132.

Eustolius, Bishop of Nicomedia, assists about 314 at the Council of Ancyra, *p.* 17. Eusebius succeeds him. *ibid.*

Eutice of Ariminum: the letter of the Mock-Council of Philippolis is directed to him. *p.* 122.

S. *Eutropius* of Adrianople: what we know of him. *p.* 52.

Eutropius, a Macedonian Priest, holds his congregations apart. *p.* 492.

Eutropius the Chamberlain has Eunomius's body remov'd and guarded about 396. *p.* 343.

Eutyches, one of the Emperor's notaries, writes down the dispute with Photinus in 351. *p.* 146.

Eutychianus of Amasea assists, as is said, at the Council of Nice. *p* 605.

Eutychius of Smyrna assists at the Council of Nice, *p.* 606, the decrees of which synod he is, as is said, appointed to publish in Asia minor. *p.* 660.

Eutychius, or Eutyches, of Eleutheropolis, governs the Church of Jerusalem after the deposition of S. Cyril &c, *p.* 335, is accus'd and excommunicated by the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 290, 299, assists at that of Constantinople in 360, *p.* 313, makes Cyril the Old Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine. *p.* 426.

Eutychius of Constantinople separates from Eunomius, and innovates in baptism. *p.* 348, 350.

Euzoïus, Deacon of Alexandria, a follower of Arius, is excommunicated with him in Egypt &c, *p.* 10, 23, and by the Council of Nice. *p.* 630. Arius brings him along with him to Constantine when he return'd from banishment in 330. *p.* 43. He is receiv'd to communion in the Council of Jerusalem in 335, *p.* 63, but is always mention'd with horror by the Church, *p.* 70, is made Bishop of Antioch in 361 &c, *p.* 352, takes off the excommunication of Seras and the rest, *p.* 338, baptizes Constantius when he was dying, *p.* 355, declares against the Aëtians in 364 &c, *p.* 340, places Lucius the Intruder in the see of Alexandria in 373. *p.* 430, 431. S. Athanasius says that he was depos'd from the episcopate. *p.* 569. He dies in 376. *p.* 456, 457.

Euzoïus, the Arian Biſhop of Cæſarea in Paleſtine in 376. *p.* 426.
Excommunication ſhould not be taken off by any but thoſe who inflicted it &c. *p.* 102, 640.
Exereſius of Geraſa in Arabia aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 313.
Exocionites or Exacionites, Arians, why call'd ſo. *p.* 354, 570.
Exoucontians, a name for the pure Arians. *p.* 218.

F

Fauſtus, an Arian Biſhop, depos'd by the Council of Illyricum in 375. *p.* 445.
Fauſtus of Riés, perhaps the author of ſome homilies aſcrib'd to Euſebius of Emiſa. *p.* 98.
Felix, the Antipope, is put into Liberius's place in 355. *p.* 187. A falſe hiſtory of his intruſion. *p.* 540. He is univerſally hated, *p.* 222, is driven out of Rome in 358, *p.* 250, might poſſibly return thither in 359 or 360, *p.* 284, dies about 368. *p.* 252. His pretended martyrdom refuted. *p.* 554--557.
Fetadius, a corruptname for S. Phebadius Biſhop of Agen. *p.* 238.
S. *Fiari*. See S. *Phebadius*.
S. *Flaccilla* the Empreſs, zealous for the true faith, *p.* 471, prevents Theodoſius from ſeeing Eunomius, *p.* 341, 485.
Flaccillus or *Flacitus*. See *Placcillus*.
S. *Flavian* being only a laïck in 350, ſupports and animates the Catholicks at Antioch, *p.* 133, obliges Leontius to depoſe Aëtius, *p.* 213, continues when a Prieſt to defend the Church againſt Valens, *p.* 409, ſucceeds S. Meletius, &c. *p.* 482. There is a difference between him and Paulinus. *p.* 482, 484.
Flavias or *Flaviopolis*, a city in Cilicia. *p.* 603.
Florentius, an Eunomian, is made Biſhop of Conſtantinople in oppoſition to Eudoxius. *p.* 339.
Forgery: Theognis of Nice counterfeits letters againſt S. Athanaſius &c. *p.* 117.
Literæ *Formatæ*: the Council of Nice did not eſtabliſh any particular form of them &c. *p.* 647.
Fortunatianus is made Biſhop of Aquilea about 344. *p.* 117. Liberius writes to him in 354, and ſpeaks of him with commendation &c. *p.* 156, 157. He ſigns the condemnation of S. Athanaſius in the Council of Milan in 355 &c, *p.* 159, makes Liberius fall in 357 &c. *p.* 228.
Fortunatus of Naples: the letter of the Mock-Council of Philippopolis is directed to him. *p.* 122, 194.
Fritigern, perhaps one of the Chiefs of the Thervingi, *p.* 587, embraces Arianiſm out of gratitude to Valens. *p.* 461.
Fronto is made Biſhop of Nicopolis in 376. *p.* 453. He joins the Arians, which makes all the people riſe upon him. *ibid.*

G

Gaius, Deacon of Alexandria, a follower of Arius, is excommunicated with him, *p.* 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.
Galatia, ſometimes call'd Gallogræcia, *p.* 114, was generally Arian in 375. *p.* 443.

Gallus Cæsar receives Arius into his friendship, after having design'd to destroy him. *p.* 214.
Gangra, a city in Paphlagonia. *p.* 361.
Garminius. See *Germinius*.
Gaudentius, a publick courier, carries Constantine's letter against Arius to Alexandria. *p.* 32.
Gaudentius of Naïssus is excommunicated by the Mock-Council of Philippopolis in 347. *p.* 123.
S. *Gaudentius* of Ariminum withdraws, as is said, from the Council of Ariminum in 359, *p.* 270, is put to death by the Governor's officers. *p.* 285. The history of him very doubtful. *p.* 264.
Gavidius succeeds S. Phebadius Bishop of Agen, *p.* 239.
Gaza, a city in Palestine. *p.* 602.
Gelasius, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 607.
Gelasius, S. Cyril of Jerusalem's nephew, is made Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, turn'd out in Valens's reign, and restor'd in Theodosius's. *p.* 426, 427, 468.
Gemellinus, an Arian Bishop of Palestine. *p.* 425.
George, Priest of Alexandria, a good master of Philosophy, &c, *p.* 27, is depos'd for being an Arian and for his debauch'd life, *ibid*, gets himself receiv'd as a Priest among the Clergy of Arethusa, *p.* 501, 502, not being able to get himself receiv'd at Antioch by S. Eustathius; *p.* 45; is propos'd in 332 by Constantine to be Bishop of Antioch, *p.* 50, is made Bishop of Laodicea, *p.* 52, assists at the Council of Jerusalem in 335, *p.* 58, at that of Antioch in 341, *p.* 94, is depos'd by that of Sardica in 347, *p.* 121, causes a Council to be assembled at Ancyra to condemn Aëtius &c, *p.* 241, assists at that of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, and perhaps at that of Constantinople in 360, *p.* 313, continues in communion with S. Cyril of Jerusalem, *p.* 321, was one of the heads of the Semiarians, *p.* 218, 290, believ'd that Jesus Christ was of God as all creatures are, *p.* 354, wrote a panegyrick upon Eusebius of Emisa. *p.* 97.
George, the Arian Bishop of Alexandria, the right arm of Arianism, *p.* 85, is ordain'd in 356, *p.* 196, employs Aëtius in the Deacon's office, *p.* 215, makes Lucius a Priest, *p.* 431, is present in 359 at the drawing up of the third confession of Sirmium, *p.* 259, assists at the Council of Seleucia, *p.* 287, where he is accus'd, *p.* 289, joins the party of the Anomœans, *p.* 287, is depos'd there. *p.* 299. The Council of Constantinople in 360 gives him an account of the excommunicates. *p.* 316. He seems to have assisted at the Council of Antioch in 361, *p.* 354, is massacred by the Heathens in Julian's reign. *p.* 359.
George, an Arian Bishop, perhaps in Cappadocia secunda, before 376, prostitutes himself to a wretched woman. *p.* 454.
The *Gepidii* receive Arianism from the Goths. *p.* 462.
Gerasa, a city of Arabia, *p.* 313.
Gerasius, Bishop of Cyprus, assists at the Council of Sardica. *p.* 607.

Germa,

Germa, a city of Helleſpont, deſtroy'd in 368 by an earthquake. *p.* 393.

Germanus, Biſhop of Neapolis or Sichem in Paleſtine, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 602.

Germinius is made Biſhop of Sirmium probably in 351, *p.* 149, is preſent at the drawing up of the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium &c. *p.* 226. Liberius writes to him after having ſign'd &c. *p.* 229. The Council of Antioch in 358 writes to him upon his having ſucceeded in propagating hereſy. *p.* 240. He is oblig'd to ſign the anathema's of the Council of Ancyra in 358, *p.* 244, cauſes the General Council of 359 to be divided into two &c, *p.* 255, is preſent at the drawing up of the third confeſſion of Sirmium in 359, *p.* 259, propoſes it at the Council of Ariminum, *p.* 264, is depos'd there, *p.* 266, afterwards reſtor'd, *p.* 272, 274, turns Semiarian and almoſt Catholick in 366, *p.* 385, anſwers Valens and Paul who were Arians &c. *p.* 386.

Gerontius, Biſhop of Lariſſa in Syria, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.

Gerontius, Biſhop of Scythia in 381. *p.* 392.

Gindarus, an epiſcopal ſee in Syria. *p.* 602.

Gloria Patri &c. Arius alters this glorification of the Trinity, *p.* 28, which was probably eſtabliſh'd before S. Ignatius's time &c, *p.* 134, and not by the Council of Nice. *p.* 647. This alteration cauſes confuſion in the Church of Antioch about 350. *p.* 132. The Council of Vaſio in 529 orders that in Gaul, as in other places, to the *Gloria Patri* ſhould be added the verſe *Sicut erat* &c. *p.* 647.

S. *Glyceria*: There was a Church of that name at Heraclea in Thrace. *p.* 189.

Golden number, cycle of nineteen years: its inſtitution. *p.* 638, 681, 682.

Gorgonius of Cynna in Galatia aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 606.

The *Goths* are converted by ſome captives whom they took about 360 in Cappadocia. *p.* 457, 458. Ulphilas their Biſhop invents letters for them, *p.* 458, draws them into Arianiſm. *p.* 461. The Gothick martyrs mention'd by S. Ambroſe, were Catholicks. *p.* 460.

Gratian becomes maſter of the Eaſt in 378, *p.* 466, where he tolerates all ſects, *p.* 148, 466, except the Eunomians, the Manicheans, and the Photinians. *p.* 342, 466.

Grecian, Biſhop of Cagli, aſſiſts at the Council of Ariminum, *p.* 262, where he deſires the Arians may be condemn'd. *p.* 266.

Gregory of Berytus: Arius names him among his partiſans. *p.* 16. He aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 611.

S. *Gregory* is made Biſhop of Armenia by S. Leontius of Cæſarea in Cappadocia. *p.* 605.

Gregory, being deſir'd by the Arians for their Biſhop of Alexandria, *p.* 92, is declar'd ſo in the Council of Antioch in 341 &c. *p.* 95, 524. Their Mock-Council of Philippopolis writes to him. *p.* 122. He ordains Auxentius Prieſt. *p.* 161.

Gregory, Prieſt of Rome, ſuffers, as is ſaid, under Conſtantius &c. *p.* 251, 252.

Gregory, Biſhop of Eliberis, does not communicate with the prevaricators of Ariminum. *p* 281, 283, 357.

S. *Gregory* Nazianzen, the Father, ſigns the confeſſion of Ariminum in 360, *p.* 329, aſſiſts at the Council of Tyanæ in 367, *p.* 388, maintains the faith couragiouſly againſt Valens in 372. *p.* 407.

S. *Gregory* Nazianzen, the Son, writes againſt Eunomius, *p.* 346, is ſent to Conſtantinople in 379, *p.* 471, where he ſuffers a great deal from the Arians. *p.* 472. Peter of Alexandria is reconcil'd to him &c. *p.* 477. He writes in 383 to Poſthumianus Prefect of the Eaſt, to reſtore peace to the Churches. *p.* 482.

Gregory, Prieſt of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, makes a paneyrick upon S. Leontius. *p.* 604.

H

H*Arpocratio*, or Arpocratio, Biſhop perhaps of Cynopolis, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 602.

Heliodorus of Sozuſa aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 313, where he is excommunicated as an abettor of Aëtius, *p.* 316, whom he makes Biſhop about 362. *p.* 339.

Helladius, Deacon of Alexandria, a follower of Arius, is excommunicated with him, *p.* 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

Hellanicus of Tripolis in Phœnicia: Arius looks upon him as his adverſary. *p.* 16, 88. He aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.

Helleſpont, infected by the Arians, *p.* 360, and the Macedonians. *p.* 364:

Heraclea, a city of Thrace. *p.* 93.

Heraclea, a town in Pontus. *p.* 247.

Heraclea, a city of Egypt in Arcadia. *p.* 602.

Heraclius, Biſhop of Zelona in Armenia magna, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 605.

Heraclius, Prieſt of Hercules at Tyre, is ordain'd Deacon by Eleuſius of Cyzicus. *p.* 319.

Herculanus, Hermogenes's ſon, maſſacred in 342. *p.* 109.

Hermogenes, General of the Horſe, is maſſacred at Conſtantinople in a ſedition in 342. *p.* 109.

Hermogenes, Præfectus Prætorio in 358. *p.* 249.

Hermogenes, Biſhop of Rhinocurura in Egypt in 431. *p.* 441.

Hermopolis, a city in Thebaïs, the place in Egypt to which it is ſaid Jeſus Chriſt retir'd. *p.* 437.

Hermopolis the leſs near Alexandria. *p.* 437.

Heſychius of the leſſer Alexandria aſſiſts at the Councils of Nice and Antioch. *p.* 603.

Heſychius, a Prieſt, publiſhes Eunomius's impiety at Conſtantinople. *p.* 333.

Hilario, Arian Biſhop of Jeruſalem in 376, *p.* 426, was dead or expell'd Jeruſalem before 379. *p.* 468.

Hilary,

Hilary, Deacon of Rome, ſent to Conſtantius in 354 &c, *p.* 156, is baniſh'd in 355. *p.* 158.

S. *Hilary*, Biſhop of Poictiers, is baniſh'd in 356 &c. *p.* 198. The Biſhops of France write to him in 358. *p.* 237. He anſwers them in his book of Synods, *p.* 258, is preſent at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, hears an impious ſermon, *p.* 293, and as ſacrilegious a diſcourſe of an Acacian, *p.* 297, openly maintains the Catholick truth againſt the Anomœans of the Weſt, *p.* 311, deſires to defend the faith in 360, and is ſent back to Poictiers. *p.* 325.

Holy Ghoſt: the Arians and Macedonians oppoſe his Divinity &c. *p.* 7, 219.

Homoouſians, a name which the Arians gave the Catholicks. *p.* 274.

Honoratus, the firſt Prefect of Conſtantinople &c. *p.* 307.

Hoſius of Corduba might have an hand in Conſtantine's letter againſt Arius, *p.* 31, appears with diſtinction at the Council of Nice, *p.* 599, 600, 659, did not aſſiſt at it as the Pope's legate, *p.* 669, makes Narciſſus acknowledge his blaſphemies, *p.* 611, diſputes, as is ſaid, with a Philoſopher by an interpreter. *p.* 653. The Euſebians anathematize him in 347. *p.* 123. He holds a Council at Corduba againſt them, *p.* 125, might be at the Council of Rome in 349 &c. *p.* 153. Liberius writes to him upon the fall of Vincentius of Capua. *p.* 156. The Arians perſecute him in 355 &c. *p.* 196. He ſigns the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium &c. *p.* 225, 226.

Hoſpitality: thoſe who had not communicatory letters, were forbidden to be receiv'd. *p.* 102.

Hugo, Biſhop of Die in Dauphiné about 1075. *p.* 609.

The *Huns* drive the Goths out of their country in 377. *p.* 461.

Hypatian is made Biſhop of Heraclea in 355, *p.* 189, is at S. Parthenius's funeral, *p.* 192, 193, is depos'd in 360, *p.* 191, is preſent at the drawing up of the third or fourth confeſſion of Sirmium in 359, *p.* 259, ſpeaks to Valentinian for the Macedonians. *p.* 369. There is no mention of him after 365, *p.* 399, unleſs he is *Hypatius* who wrote in 366 to Liberius &c. *p.* 380--389.

S. *Hypatius*, Biſhop of Gangra, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, is martyr'd afterwards &c. *p.* 605, 606.

Hypatius is made Biſhop of Nice in 370 by the Arians &c, *p.* 395, retires in 381 to Cyrus in the Euphrateſian Syria &c. *p.* 476, 487.

Hypſius, Biſhop of Parnaſſus, is, as is ſaid, Hythius or Evethus who is nam'd in Liberius's letter in 366. *p.* 379, 380. Demoſthenes Lieutenant of Pontus turns him out in 375. *p.* 451.

Hythius, nam'd in Liberius's letter in 366, perhaps Hypatian. *p.* 379.

I

S. *James* of Niſibis aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.

Iconium, the metropolis of Lycaonia. *p.* 444.

Jeruſalem: the Council of Nice confirms the privileges of that Church. *p.* 641. What they were. *p.* 642. Whether the Biſhop of Jeruſalem was independent. *p.* 683, 684.

JESUS CHRIST was carried, as is believ'd, to Hermopolis, when he fled into Egypt. *p.* 437. His victory over the world continues by the sufferings of his elect. *p.* 403.

Innocent I. consults Aurelius of Carthage about Easter for the year 414. *p.* 637.

John, Bishop of Persia, assists at the Council of Nice, *p.* 609, the decrees of which synod he is, as is said, appointed to publish in Persia and India. *p.* 659, 660.

John, the Melitian Bishop of Memphis, continues in schism after the Council of Nice. *p.* 633, 634. He is probably *John* Archaph, who was at the head of the schism after Melitius, *p.* 634, is banish'd in 336, *p.* 77.

S. *John* Chrysostom nourishes and fortifies his vertue in silence and privacy, *p.* 410, builds a church over the tomb of S. Martyrius and S. Marcian. *p.* 203.

Jovian, who was made Emperor in 363, follows the Catholick faith &c, *p.* 365, dies on the 16th of February 364. *p.* 367.

Jovian, Deacon of Sirmium in 366. *p.* 386.

Irenæus, probably Deacon of Mareotis, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 11, signs his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

S. *Irenio* Bishop of Gaza after Asclepas till the year 390. *p.* 137, 138.

Irenopolis or Neronias, a city in Cilicia. *p.* 16.

Isaac, an Egyptian Bishop, banish'd for the faith in 373. *p.* 436.

S. *Isaac*, an hermit, foretells to Valens his defeat and death in 378. *p.* 466, 588.

S. *Isidore*, Bishop of Hermopolis in Egypt, banish'd for the faith in 363. &c. *p.* 436.

Julian, Deacon of Alexandria, a follower of Arius, is excommunicated with him, *p.* 10, signs his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

Julian the apostate: Aëtius sees him, being sent to him by Gallus Cæsar &c. *p.* 215. He recalls all who were banish'd for religion, *p.* 358, writes to Photinus, *p.* 147, invites Aëtius to come to Court &c, *p.* 339, dies in 363. *p.* 365. On what side Eusebius of Nicomedia was related to him. *p.* 501.

S. *Julian* Saba goes to Antioch to support the Catholicks in 372, *p.* 413, in his return causes Asterius an Arian Bishop to die by his prayers &c. *p.* 68, 413, 414.

Julius, a follower of Arius, is excommunicated with him, *p.* 10, signs his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

S. *Julius*, Pope, speaks with horror of the reception of Arius by the Council of Jerusalem, *p.* 70, rejects Carpones sent to him by Gregory. *p.* 71. The Arians press him to write to Pistus of Alexandria. *p.* 83. The Council of Antioch in 341 writes to him. *p.* 107, 526. He gives Constans an account of the misbehaviour of the Eusebians with regard to S. Athanasius and S. Paul of Constantinople. *p.* 112. The Eusebians excommunicate him in 347 at Philippopolis, *p.* 123, write to him against S. Athanasius about 351. *p.* 126. He dies in 352. *p.* 149.

Justin, a Bishop, deputed by the Council of Ariminum after his prevarication. *p.* 278. The Semiarians depos'd at Constantinople in 360, write against him, *p.* 322, 323, require of the Westerns

Westerns in 366, that they should look upon him as an excommunicate. p. 379.

Justina the Empress endeavours to restore Arianism in the West. p. 490.

Juvencus, Prefect of Rome in 366 and 367. p. 573.

L

L*Ampsacus*, a considerable city in Hellespont. p. 191, 370.

Laodicea, a city in Syria, p. 16, and in Phœnicia Libani, p. 325, 416.

Lauritius the General favours the pure Arians, p. 301, assists at the Council of Seleucia in 359. p. 288. The Acacians make their complaint to him, p. 295, get him to banish Anianus elected Bishop of Antioch. p. 300.

Legates à latere, Ecclesiasticks of Rome deputed by the Pope. p. 599.

S. *Leo*, Priest of Ariminum: the history of him a very faulty piece. p. 565.

Leonas, a Quæstor, favours the pure Arians, p. 301, assists at the Council of Seleucia in 359, p. 288, will make it begin without regarding those who were absent. p. 291. The Acacians make their complaint to him &c. p. 295. He reads their Act in the Council. p. 296. They get him to banish Anianus elected Bishop of Antioch. p. 300. He breaks up the Council. p. 298.

S. *Leontius*, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, assists at the Council of Nice, p. 604, disputes there, as is said, with a philosopher, p. 653, and is appointed to publish the decrees of that synod in Cappadocia &c. p. 660. Philostorgius slanderously makes him an abettor of Arius. p. 612.

Leontius is present at the dispute between Basil and Photinus in 351, p. 146, is made Prefect of Rome, brings Liberius to Milan. p. 184.

Leontius, a disciple, as is said, of S. Lucian of Antioch, p. 20, cannot get himself receiv'd into the Clergy by S. Eustathius, p. 45, is made Bishop of Antioch in 348 by the Arians. p. 52, 131. His behaviour in the episcopate. p. 134, 135. S. Athanasius will not communicate with him. p. 127. He explains the Prophets to Aëtius, p. 209, 210, raises him to the Diaconate and deposes him about 350, p. 212, 213, gets him into Gallus's favour, p. 214, dies in 358. p. 231.

Leontius, a Priest, deputed by the Council of Ancyra in 358 to Constantius. p. 243.

Leontius, Macedonian Bishop of Comana, addresses a petition to Jovian &c. p. 366.

Liberius is made Pope in 352, and almost stagger'd by the Eusebians. p. 149, 150. His legates yield in the Council of Arles in 353. p. 153. He writes to Hosius upon the fall of Vincentius &c, p. 156, disregards the solicitations of Constantius and the eunuchs in 355, p. 180, is brought to Milan p. 184, banish'd to Berea. p. 186. The Romans desire he may be recall'd in 357. p. 221. He signs the first confession of Sirmium to obtain his restoration &c. p. 227--230, 546-548. Who was the author of the anathema's against him inserted

in the letter given us by S. Hilary. *p.* 545. He comes to Sirmium, and there ſigns the anathema's of the Council of Ancyra in 358, *p.* 245, 550, 551, returns to Rome and drives Felix from thence. *p.* 249 &c. He is made the author of the perſecution of S. Euſebius Prieſt of Rome. *p.* 251. He refuſes to conſent to the decrees of Ariminum in 359, *p.* 283, which might perhaps oblige him to leave Rome. *p.* 285. The ſpuriouſneſs of his confeſſion of faith ſent to S. Athanaſius &c. *p.* 559. The Macedonians ſend a deputation to him in 366. *p.* 379. He receives them to communion, *p.* 382, 574, 575, and dies upon the 24th of September 366. *p.* 383, 573. Foundation of the Church of his name. *p.* 574.

Libya: The Cyrenian or Eaſtern Libya produc'd in fifty years Sabellianiſm and Arianiſm. *p.* 1, 2.

Licinius favours the tranſlation of Euſebius of Berytus to Nicomedia &c. *p.* 18.

Longianus, Biſhop of Neocæſarea, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 605.

S. *Lucian*, Martyr of Antioch: The principal Arians boaſt of having had him for their maſter. *p.* 19, 20, 232 &c. It is ſaid, that he recover'd Aſterius the Arian ſophiſt from apoſtaſy. *p.* 67. The Euſebians publiſh a creed under his name. *p.* 99, 389.

Lucifer of Cagliari offers himſelf to Liberius in 354 to go and deſire a Council of the Emperor &c, *p.* 156, is baniſh'd in 355 &c, *p.* 158, ſuffers a great deal in his exile, *p.* 197, under Eutychius of Eleutheropolis, *p.* 290, and Eudoxius of Germanicia, *p.* 233, is recall'd in Julian's reign. *p.* 359.

Lucius, Deacon of Alexandria, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

S. *Lucius* is made Biſhop of Adrianople about 335, and baniſh'd quickly after, *p.* 53, 87, 88, might perhaps be recall'd from baniſhment in 338, *p.* 82, goes to the Council of Rome in 340 &c, *p.* 88, 517, to the Council of Sardica in 347, after which the Euſebians cauſe him to be baniſh'd and ſent out of the world. *p.* 128, 140, 534, 535.

Lucius, an Arian, is made Biſhop of Samoſata in 374, and perſecutes the Catholicks there. *p.* 444.

Lucius, an Arian, uſurps the ſee of Alexandria in 373, and raiſes there a terrible perſecution, *p.* 430--442, is driven from thence in 378 by the people, and afterwards by Theodoſius. *p.* 465.

Lupus, Biſhop of Cilicia, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 604, perhaps the ſame with Lupus Biſhop of Tarſus. *ibid.*

Lydda, or Dioſpolis, a city of Paleſtine. *p.* 16.

M

Macarius, Deacon of Alexandria, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

S. *Macarius* of Jeruſalem is look'd upon by Arius as his adverſary. *p.* 16. He aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 601, where he diſputes, as is ſaid, with a Philoſopher, *p.* 653, is appointed to publiſh the decrees of that ſynod in Paleſtine. *p.* 659. Conſtan-

ſtantine gives him veſtments to celebrate baptiſm in. *p.* 235. He dies before 335. *p.* 53.

Macarius or Arius, a Biſhop, is baniſh'd in 347. *p.* 129.

Macarius aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 314.

Macarius: Two Saints of that name, hermits, are baniſh'd in Valens's reign, &c. *p.* 456.

The *Macedonians* or Pneumatomaci begin in 362, &c. *p.* 362. Their principal error was oppoſing the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt. *ibid.* Some of them would neither deny nor aſſert it. *p.* 470. They ſpread in Aſia. *p.* 364. Jovian rejects their petition in 363. *p.* 366. They hold a great Council at Lampſacus in 365. *p.* 370. Eudoxius ſets Valens againſt them. *p.* 373. They ſend a deputation to Pope Liberius in 366, and ſign the Conſubſtantiality, &c, *p.* 378 --- 381, are receiv'd to communion by Liberius, *p.* 382, by ſeveral Churches of the Weſt, *p.* 385, and by the Biſhops of the Council of Tyanæ in 367. *p.* 388. Some of them oppoſe an entire re-union. *p.* 389. They relapſe or perſevere in ſchiſm in 378. *p.* 469. Neither the deſires nor the reaſons of the General Council nor Theodoſius can re-unite them in 381. *p.* 479, 480. Theodoſius in the year 383 forbids them to meet, *p.* 487, orders an exact enquiry to be made after them, and to be ſent out of Conſtantinople in 384. *p.* 489.

Macedonius of Mopſueſtia: It may be doubted whether he was at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603, 667. He aſſiſts at that of Jeruſalem in 335, *p.* 58, and at that of Antioch in 341, *p.* 93, carries a new creed of the Euſebians to the Weſterns in 345, *p.* 118, aſſiſts in 351 at the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus, *p.* 143, was dead in 360. *p.* 317.

Macedonius, an embroiderer and Prieſt of Conſtantinople under S. Alexander, *p.* 527, 528, cannot get himſelf made Biſhop of Conſtantinople in 336. *p.* 77. The Euſebians make him Biſhop of that city in 341. *p.* 108. The murders and tumults which his election cauſes. *p.* 109, 110. He is reduc'd in 348 to one ſingle church which he had built, &c. *p.* 137, becomes maſter of all the churches in 350, perſecutes the Catholicks and Novatians cruelly, *p.* 200 --- 204, removes Conſtantine's corpſe in 356. *p.* 206. George of Laodicea writes to him againſt the Anomœans in 358. *p.* 241. Baſil gains him to his party. *p.* 249. He aſſiſts at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, where he is accus'd, *p.* 290, does not go to the firſt ſeſſion, *p.* 291, is depos'd in the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 319, retires to a neighbouring place, *p.* 322, forms in Julian's reign a ſect of his name or the Pneumatomaci, *p.* 219, 362, dies ſhortly after. *p.* 322.

Macrinus of Eleutheropolis aſſiſts at the Council of Paleſtine in 349. *p.* 602.

Magnentius riſes againſt Conſtans, *p.* 140, is defeated in 351, *p.* 142, kills himſelf in 353. *p.* 151.

Magnus of Peluſium aſſiſts at the Councils of Nice and Antioch. *p.* 603.

Magnus of Themiſus in Phrygia is preſent, accus'd, and excommunicated in the Council of Seleucia in 359. *p.* 290, 299.

Count

Count *Magnus* in 373 guards Lucius the uſurper of the Church of Alexandria, &c. *p.* 431.

Mantinia, a canton of Paphlagonia. *p.* 205.

Marathonius is made Biſhop of Nicomedia in 358 or 360, &c, *p.* 200, or rather in Julian's reign, *p.* 543, follows the principles and ſupports the ſect of Macedonius, *p.* 220, which takes likewiſe the name of Marathonius. *p.* 363. Oneſimus is perhaps put in his place in 360. *p.* 325. He took perhaps the title of Biſhop of Conſtantinople after Macedonius. *p.* 363.

Marcellus of Ancyra aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 606, never communicated, as is ſaid, with Aſclepas of Gaza. *p.* 46. Photinus ſtudied under him. *p.* 114. He goes to Jeruſalem in 335, but is not concern'd in any thing that was done there, *p.* 59, is depos'd by the Euſebians in 336 upon the pretence of his book againſt Aſterius, *p.* 66, is reſtor'd in 338, *p.* 82, comes to Rome in 340 to the Council deſir'd by the Euſebians, *p.* 87, is not the Biſhop ſuſpected of Sabellianiſm in the Council of Antioch in 341, *p.* 567, is recall'd in the year 348. *p.* 136. His return cauſes great diſturbances at Antioch. *p.* 137. He is driven from thence again in 350. *p.* 140.

Marcellus, Biſhop of Campania, the Pope's legate to the Council of Arles in 353, gives up S. Athanaſius and his cauſe. *p.* 152, 153.

Marcellus, who is made a Martyr of Nicomedia, was perhaps Marculus the pretended martyr of the Donatiſts in Numidia. *p.* 518.

S. *Marcian*, Chanter and Reader of Conſtantinople, and Martyr about 350. *p.* 202.

Marcian, Prieſt of Ariminum, depos'd, as is ſaid, by S. Gaudentius. *p.* 564.

Marcian the Governor cauſes, as is ſaid, S. Gaudentius to be us'd ill. *p.* 564.

Marcian, a Novatian Prieſt, teaches Valens's daughters, &c. *p.* 245, gets Agelius the Novatian Biſhop of Conſtantinople recall'd. *p.* 376.

Marcian, Macedonian Biſhop of Lampſacus, is preſent at the General Council of Conſtantinople in 381. *p.* 479.

Marcianople, a city in Mœſia. *p.* 392, 393.

Mardonius, Lord Chamberlain, makes an attempt, but in vain, upon S. Baſil's reſolution in 372. *p.* 407.

Mariaceſius in the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, probably a miſtake for Maris Acacius. *p.* 313.

Marinus of Troas aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 606, the decrees of which ſynod he is, as is ſaid, appointed to publiſh in Aſia minor, &c. *p.* 660.

S. *Marinus*, Deacon of Ariminum: the hiſtory of him a very faulty piece. *p.* 565.

Marinus is made Biſhop of the Arians at Conſtantinople in 386, &c. *p.* 490. Dorotheus makes a party againſt him which continues for 35 years. *p.* 593.

Maris of Chalcedon, a partiſan of Arius, *p.* 16, was, as is ſaid, a diſciple of S. Lucian of Antioch, *p.* 19, aſſiſts at the Coun-

cil of Nice, *p.* 611, and at that of Jeruſalem in 335, *p.* 58, goes from thence to Conſtantine to oppoſe S. Athanaſius, *p.* 65, aſſiſts at the Council of Antioch in 341, *p.* 93, makes Macedonius Biſhop of Conſtantinople after Euſebius, *p.* 108, excommunicates ſome perſons who retire to Cyzicus, *p.* 319, is ſent on a deputation in 342 to Conſtans, &c. *p.* 111, defends the doctrine of the Anomœans againſt Baſil in 359, *p.* 307, aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 313.

Marius. See *Victorinus.*

Mark, a follower of Arius, is excommunicated with him, *p.* 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

Mark, perſecuted by Hoſius according to the Euſebians. *p.* 124.

Mark of Arethuſa is ſent in 342 by the Euſebians to Conſtans, *p.* 111, aſſiſts in 351 at the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus, *p.* 143, at the third confeſſion of Sirmium in 359, *p.* 259, and ſigns it. *p.* 298.

Mark, Deacon of Gaza, writes the life of S. Porphyry. *p.* 137.

Mark, a Photinian heretick, driven out of Rome. *p.* 148.

Marmarica, rather a canton than a city of Libya. *p.* 10.

Marriage: The Council of Gangra anathematizes the wives who leave their husbands, as if they could not be ſav'd in a married ſtate. *p.* 687.

Martial, deputed by the Council of Ariminum to Conſtantius after his prevarication. *p.* 278.

Martianus the ſecretary is order'd to ſuppreſs the ſecond confeſſion of Sirmium. *p.* 245.

S. *Martin* of Tours ſuffers in 355 for the faith in Illyricum, &c. *p.* 195.

Martyrius, an Arian Biſhop, carries a new creed of the Euſebians to the Weſterns in 345. *p.* 118.

S. *Martyrius*, Subdeacon of Conſtantinople and Martyr about 350. *p.* 202.

Martyrius, Subdeacon of Sirmium in 366. *p.* 386.

Mavia, Queen of the Saracens, deſires S. Moſes for a Biſhop about 375. *p.* 442.

Mauritius of Epiphania aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.

Maximinopolis, a city of Paleſtine. *p.* 602.

S. *Maximinus* of Treves gets S. Paul of Conſtantinople reſtor'd, *p.* 88, rejects the deputies of the Euſebians in 342, *p.* 113, who excommunicate him in 347 at Philippopolis. *p.* 123.

Maximus of Salona: The Mock-Council of Philippopolis in 347 writes to him. *p.* 122.

Maximus, a philoſopher and magician, was tutor to Julian the apoſtate and Siſinnius a Novatian. *p.* 483.

S. *Maximus* or Maximonas, a Confeſſor, Biſhop of Jeruſalem before 335. *p.* 53. Sozomen's account of his ordination is ſuſpicious. *p.* 510. He might poſſibly conſent to the depoſition of S. Athanaſius in 335, *p.* 511, refuſes to go to the Council of Antioch in 341, *p.* 94, receives S. Athanaſius in 349, *p.* 138, dies in 350 or 351. *p.* 54, 141.

S. *Maximus*, Biſhop of Naples, is baniſh'd in 355, and dies in exile, &c. *p.* 193, 542.

S. *Ma-*

S. *Maximus*, perhaps the author of the five dialogues upon the Trinity, &c. *p.* 100.

Megasus, an Arian Bishop of Illyricum, assists at the Council of Ariminum in the year 359, *p.* 262, is sent a deputy by that synod to Constantius, *p.* 278, assists perhaps at the Council of Constantinople in 360. *p.* 313. The Semiarians depos'd in that Council write against him, *p.* 322, 323, require in 366 that the Westerns should look upon him as an excommunicate. *p.* 379.

The *Melandesian* port of Constantinople. *p.* 202.

S. *Melania* the grandmother sees S. Isidore at Nitria in 367, *p.* 438, assists the confessors of Egypt who were banish'd into Palestine in 373, *p.* 437, brings back to the Church some Macedonians of Palestine about 380. *p.* 364.

S. *Melas*, Bishop of Rhinocurura in Egypt and Confessor: The history of him. *p.* 440, 441.

S. *Meletius* of Sebastopolis assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 605. Philostorgius slanderously makes him an abettor of Arius. *p.* 612.

S. *Meletius* is made Bishop of Antioch in 361, *p.* 325, 350, and banish'd a month after, *p.* 351, did not separate the Orthodox from the Arians, *p.* 569, is recall'd by Julian, *p.* 359, banish'd perhaps and recall'd by Valens in 365, *p.* 372, and banish'd again in 371. *p.* 400.

The *Melitians:* Decree of the Council of Nice for the reception of them. *p.* 631. Others continue the schism, &c. *p.* 34, 35.

Melitius: Decree of the Council of Nice for the reception of him. *p.* 631. He joins Arius, as is said, *p.* 13, 612, dies about 326, and makes John Archaph his successor and head of the schism. *p.* 634.

Melitopolis, a city in Hellespont. *p.* 191.

Menas, Deacon of Alexandria, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 10, signs his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

S. *Menedemus*, one of the eighty Ecclesiasticks of Constantinople, martyr'd in 370. *p.* 396.

Menophantus, Bishop of Ephesus, a partisan of Arius, *p.* 16, was, as is said, a disciple of S. Lucian of Antioch, *p.* 19, assists at the Council of Nice, *p.* 611, is depos'd by the Council of Sardica in 347, *p.* 121, ordains George Bishop of Alexandria in 356. *p.* 197.

Menophilus or Demophilus, a pure Arian, *p.* 309, assists at the Council of Constantinople in 360. *p.* 313.

Mentz: The history of the first Bishops of that place has no foundation. *p.* 539.

S. *Mercurial*, Bishop of Forli, was dead, as is said, in 156. *p.* 564.

Mesopotamia: Some schismaticks there celebrate Easter with the Jews before and after the Council of Nice. *p.* 634, 636.

Metropolitan: The Council of Antioch regulates and gives this privilege to the Bishops of the capital cities of every province, *p.* 102, forbids Bishops to go to Court without their letters, &c. *p.* 103, orders them to call in other Bishops, when those of the province do not agree in their judgment. *Ibid.*

Midaium

Midaium or *Migde*, a town in Phrygia. *p.* 247.
Migdonius, Biſhop of Illyricum, aſſiſts at the Council of Ariminum, *p.* 262, which after its prevarication ſends him to Conſtantius. *p.* 278.
S. *Milles*, Biſhop of Perſia and Martyr, aſſiſts, as is ſaid, at the Council of Jeruſalem in 335. *p.* 59.
S. *Mocius*, his church near Conſtantinople falls about 387 upon the Arians who poſſeſs'd it, &c. *p.* 474.
Modeſtus, Præfectus Prætorio in 370, baniſhes Eunomius, *p.* 341, puts to death 80 Eccleſiaſticks of Conſtantinople &c, *p.* 397, perſecutes the Catholicks every where in 371 and 372. *p.* 405, 406. Valens ſtrikes him, being angry with him for not diſperſing the Faithful of Edeſſa, &c. *p.* 420. He baniſhes the Eccleſiaſticks of that place. *p.* 421, 422.
Monks: Valens in 376 makes a law to oblige them to bear arms. *p.* 455.
Montius, put to death by Gallus in 354. *p.* 215.
Mopſueſtia, a city in Cilicia. *p.* 603.
Moſes of Caſtabala aſſiſts at the Councils of Nice and Antioch. *p.* 603.
S. *Moſes* refuſes to be ordain'd Biſhop by Lucius the Arian Biſhop of Alexandria. *p.* 442.
Murſa, a city of Pannonia. *p.* 61.
Strategius *Muſonianus*, a Count, writes to Conſtantine in 332, &c. *p.* 50.
Muzonius, Biſhop of Byzacena, aſſiſts at the Council of Ariminum in 359 &c, *p.* 262, makes Valens of Murſa pronounce ſeveral anathema's there. *p.* 277.

N

Narciſſus, Biſhop of Neronias, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 611, is a partiſan of Arius, *p.* 16, whom he equals in impiety, *p.* 26, chooſes Euſebius of Cæſarea for the biſhoprick of Antioch in 332, *p.* 49, aſſiſts at the Council of Jeruſalem in 335, *p.* 58, at that of Antioch in 341, *p.* 93, is ſent on a deputation to Conſtans in 342, *p.* 111, is depos'd by the Council of Sardica in 347, *p.* 121, aſſiſts at the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus in 351, *p.* 143, ordains George Biſhop of Alexandria in 356, *p.* 197, complains to Conſtantius in 358 of Baſil's behaviour. *p.* 256.
Naucratis, a city in Ægyptus prima. *p.* 602.
Naxus, an iſland, one of the Cyclades. *p.* 341.
Neapolis or Sichem, a city of Paleſtine. *p.* 602.
Nectaria, a Deaconeſs of Satala in 360. *p.* 320.
Nectarius, Biſhop of Conſtantinople, a weak mild man, *p.* 481, is preſent in 383, as is ſaid, at a conference with all the heads of the ſects. *p.* 482. S. Gregory Nazianzen ſtirs him up againſt the Arians. *p.* 489. They burn his houſe in 388. *p.* 493.
Neo or *Neonas*, Biſhop of Seleucia, lends his church in 359 for the conſecration of Anianus Biſhop of Antioch, *p.* 300, ſigns the letter of the deputies of the Council of Seleucia to thoſe of Ariminum, *p.* 310, is depos'd by the Council of Conſtantinople in 360. *p.* 320.
Neocæſarea, a town in Pontus. *p.* 434.

Neocæsarea, a city of Syria. *p.* 603.
Neronias, or Irenopolis, a city of Cilicia. *p.* 16.
Nicæ, a town of Thrace, formerly Ustodizo or Ostudizus. *p.* 270, 271.
Nicasius, Bishop of Die rather than of Digne, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 609.
Nice, the ancient metropolis of Bithynia, *p.* 597, suffers very much by an earthquake in 358, *p.* 257, is destroy'd by earthquakes in 368. *p.* 393.
Nicetas of Flavias assists at the Councils of Nice and Antioch. *p.* 603.
S. *Nicetas*, Bishop of the Goths, and Martyr about 400. *p.* 460, 463.
Nicetas, a secretary, writes down the dispute between Basil and Photinus in 351. *p.* 146.
S. *Nicholas*, Bishop of Myra, assists, as is said, at the Council of Nice. *p.* 607.
Nicomachus of Bostra assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.
Nicomedia, the metropolis of Bithynia &c, *p.* 17, is destroy'd by an earthquake in 358. *p.* 253.
Nicopolis, the metropolis of the lesser Armenia. *p.* 453.
Nisibis, a city in Mesopotamia. *p.* 603.
The *Novatians*: The Council of Nice receives them according to their dignities by Confirmation which they did not give. *p.* 650. They are persecuted by the Arians, &c. *p.* 203---205.
Nuneches of Laodicea assists at the Council of Nice, *p.* 606, the decrees of which synod he is, as is said, appointed to publish. *p.* 660.

O

Oblations: Liberius causes those of Eusebius the Arian Lord Chamberlain to be thrown out of the Church. *p.* 182.
Oltiserium, a village in Cappadocia. *p.* 330.
Olympius, Bishop of Enos in Thrace, persecuted by the Arians about 340 and 347. *p.* 90, 128.
Olympius assists at the dispute between Basil and Photinus in 351. *p.* 146.
Olympius, a secretary, writes down that dispute. *p.* 146.
Olympius, Bishop of Mopsuestia in 381. *p.* 568.
Onesimus is made Bishop of Nicomedia in 360. *p.* 325.
Onuphis, an episcopal see in Egypt. *p.* 437.
Optatus, a deputy of the Council of Ariminum to Constantius after their prevarication, &c. *p.* 278.
Optatus, Prefect of Egypt in Theodosius's reign. *p.* 479.
S. *Orosius*, Priest of Rome about 358, &c. *p.* 251.
Ostudizus. See *Nicæ*.
Otreus, Bishop of Melitene, assists at the Council of Tyanæ in 367. *p.* 388.
Oxyrinchus, a city of Egypt in Arcadia. *p.* 419.

P

Pacinicus, Macedonian Bishop of Zena, addresses a petition to Jovian. *p.* 366.
Pacneumonis, an episcopal see in Egypt. *p.* 437.
Palladius, an Arian Bishop, complains in 366 of the Ecclesiasticks of Sirmium. *p.* 386.

Palladius, a Pagan, Prefect of Egypt, commits horrid outrages upon Peter of Alexandria in 373 &c, *p.* 429, receives orders to put Lucius in his place, *p.* 431, forbids any weeping upon the account of his cruelties. *p.* 433.

Palladius, a Bishop, banish'd to Antinopolis for S. Chrysostom. *p.* 438.

Paltus, a city of Syria. *p.* 89.

Pambo, a Confessor banish'd into Palestine in 373. *p.* 436.

Panaphysus, a city of Egypt in Augustamnica prima. *p.* 602.

Pancratius, or *Pancarius*, of Ancyra was not at the Council of Nice. *p.* 606, 667.

Pancratius, Priest of Rome, goes in 354 to desire a Council of Constantius &c, *p.* 156, is banish'd in 355. *p.* 158.

Pancratius of Pelusium, perhaps a Melitian, assists at the third confession of Sirmium, *p.* 259, and at the Council of Seleucia in 359 &c. *p.* 290.

Paphlagonia: There were great numbers of Novatians in this province, who were very much persecuted about 360. *p.* 205.

S. *Paphnutius*, Bishop in the higher Thebaïs and Confessor, assists at the Council of Nice, *p.* 602, 610, opposes the Clergy's separating from their wives, which was design'd to be establish'd there, *p.* 649, 687, 688, prevents S. Maximus of Jerusalem from taking a dangerous step. *p.* 53.

Paphnutius, Bishop of Saïs in Egypt, banish'd in Constantius's reign &c. *p.* 437.

Paphnutius, Confessor of Egypt, banish'd into Palestine in 373. *p.* 436.

Parammon, Deacon of Mareotis, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 11, signs his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

Parish-Priests in the country were allow'd to give communicatory letters. *p.* 102.

S. *Parthenius*, Bishop of Lampsacus: the history of him. *p.* 189——193.

Paterius, Prefect of Egypt in 324. *p.* 32.

S. *Patient*, Bishop of Lions, converts a great many Photinians about 474. *p.* 148.

Patrophilus of Scythopolis, a partisan of Arius, *p.* 16, whom he equals in impiety, *p.* 26, and whose schism he authorizes. *p.* 28. He assists at the Council of Nice; *p.* 611; at the deposition of S. Eustathius of Antioch in 331; *p.* 45; at the Council of Jerusalem in 335, *p.* 59, from whence he goes to Constantine to oppose S. Athanasius; *p.* 65; at the Council of Antioch in 341; *p.* 93; ordains George Bishop of Alexandria in 356, *p.* 197, makes S. Eusebius of Vercellæ suffer very much, *ibid*, complains to Constantius of Basil's behaviour, *p.* 256, causes the General Council of the year 359 to be divided into two, *p.* 255, assists at that of Seleucia, *p.* 287, where he is accus'd, *p.* 289, does not go the first session, *p.* 291, is depos'd by that synod. *p.* 299. The Council of Constantinople in 360 writes to him. *p.* 324. Philip succeeds him *p.* 425.

S. *Paul*, Bishop of Neocæsarea, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603, 610.

Paul of Laranda assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 613.
Paul is made Bishop of Tyre in 331. *p.* 49.
S. *Paul* assists at the Council of Nice, when only a Reader &c, *p.* 660, is made Bishop of Constantinople in 336. *p.* 77. Macedonius makes a disturbance, afterwards submits to him. *p.* 108. He is banish'd soon after, *p.* 77, is recall'd in 338, *p.* 82, and depos'd immediately after, *p.* 83, is twice restor'd and twice expell'd in 342, *p.* 109, 110, goes to the Council of Rome, and is recall'd in 348, *p.* 88, 136, is banish'd again in 350, and at last strangled. *p.* 140.
Paul, Bishop of Maximinopolis, assists at the Council of Palestine in 349. *p.* 602.
Paul of Emisa assists at the Council of Constantinople in 360, *p.* 313, at that of Tyanæ in 367, *p.* 388.
Paul, an Arian Bishop, writes to Germinius in 366 upon his changing his principles. *p.* 386.
Paul, an Egyptian Bishop and Confessor in Valens's reign. *p.* 439.
S. *Paula* sees S. Isidore Bishop of Hermopolis at Nitria about 387. *p.* 438.
Paulinus of Tyre: Arius names him among his partisans, *p.* 16. Eusebius of Nicomedia writes to him in Arius's favour, *p.* 25, 26, whom he equals in impiety, *p.* 26, and whose schism he authorizes. *p.* 28. He assists at the Council of Nice, *p.* 611, is Aetius's first tutor, *p.* 209, usurps the bishoprick of Antioch in 331 &c, *p.* 47, 509, dies six months after. *p.* 48.
Paulinus, Bishop of Dacia, defended by Hosius. *p.* 124.
S. *Paulinus* is made Bishop of Treves in 349, *p.* 154, is banish'd for the faith in 353, and dies in 358 &c. *p.* 154, 159, 288, 538.
Paulinus, Bishop of Antioch, against S. Meletius in 383 &c. *p.* 482, 484.
Pederotus, *Pedorus*, or Phædrus, Bishop of Heraclea, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 607.
S. *Pelagius* is made Bishop of Laodicea in Syria in 360, *p.* 325, assists at the Council of Tyanæ in 367, *p.* 388, confesses the faith in Valens's reign about 372 &c. *p.* 416, 417.
Pelusium, a city of Phœnicia, *p.* 603.
Penitents: The Council of Nice allows Bishops to shorten the time of their penance in certain cases, *p.* 643, orders the Eucharist to be given to all penitents who desire it at the point of death. &c. *ibid.*
Pepuza, a town in Phrygia. *p.* 247.
S. *Peter* of Alexandria makes Arius a Deacon, afterwards casts him out of the Church. &c. *p.* 4.
Peter of Gindarus assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.
Peter of Aila in Palestine receives S. Athanasius in 349. *p.* 602.
Peter is made Bishop of Alexandria in 373, *p.* 428, is persecuted immediately after, *p.* 429, is oblig'd to retire to Rome, *p.* 434, 435, 580, returns in 378, and is restor'd to the possession of his Church, *p.* 465. Theodosius in 380 orders his subjects to follow the faith taught by Peter. *p.* 473. He dies in 381 &c. *p.* 476, 590.
Phædrus. See *Pederotus*.

Phanellus. See *Placcillus.*
S. *Phebadius*, at preſent S. Fiari, Biſhop of Agen after 347 till 392, writes againſt the Arians &c. *p.* 238. An account of what we know of him. *p.* 238, 239. He aſſiſts at the Council of Ariminum in 359, *p.* 262, where he ſuffers himſelf to be deceiv'd with the reſt. *p.* 275.
Phedo, a philoſopher, diſputes in the Council of Nice. *p.* 653.
Pheno, a copper-mine in Paleſtine &c. *p.* 433.
Phidelius. See *Philedius.*
Philadelphia, a city in Lydia, *p.* 289, and in Syria. *p.* 603.
Philadelphus, Biſhop of Juliopolis, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 606.
Philagrius is made Prefect of Egypt a ſecond time in 340. *p.* 92.
Philedius, Phidelius, or *Philicadius* of Auguſtopolis is excommunicated by the Council of Seleucia in 359. *p.* 290, 299.
Philetus or *Philip*, Biſhop of Melitopolis about 330. *p.* 191.
Philip, Biſhop of Panæphyſus in Egypt, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 602.
Philip, Præfectus Prætorio, turns S. Paul out of Conſtantinople in 342 &c, *p.* 110, has him ſtrangled in 350. *p.* 140.
Philip, Arian Biſhop of Scythopolis, Patrophilus's ſucceſſor. *p.* 425.
Philippopolis, a city of Thrace. *p.* 121.
S. *Philogonius* of Antioch: Arius reckons him one of his adverſaries. *p.* 16.
Several *Philoſophers* come to the Council of Nice, and diſpute there &c. *p.* 651.
Philoſtorgius, an Eunomian hiſtorian. *p.* 349.
Philoxenus, Prieſt of Rome, goes into the Eaſt in 341 to cite the Euſebians to the Council of Rome, *p.* 87, is detain'd by them beyond the time appointed. *p.* 107.
Philumenus is made Biſhop of Cæſarea in Paleſtine about 372. *p.* 426.
Philus or *Phœbus* of Polychalandæ is accus'd in the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 290, is excommunicated there, *p.* 299, aſſiſts at the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 313, where he is excommunicated as an abettor of Arius. *p.* 316.
Photinus, Biſhop of Sirmium, begins in 342 to publiſh his hereſy. *p.* 113. The hiſtory of him and his hereſy. *p.* 114, &c. His error is condemn'd in 345 in a Creed of the Euſebians. *p.* 119. He is condemn'd in 347, not by the Council of Sardica, *p.* 536, but by the Council of Milan, *p.* 129, 130, and in 349 by a Council of Sirmium, *p.* 138, 139, is at laſt depos'd by the Euſebians in 351 &c, *p.* 143--149, 537, dies about 376. *p.* 148.
Phrygia, infected by the Macedonians in 375. *p.* 364.
Piammon carries alms to the Confeſſors of Alexandria under Lucius. *p.* 434.
Pinara, a city of Lycia. *p.* 290.
Piperius of Samoſata aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.
Piſtus or Poſtus, Biſhop of Athens, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 608.

Piſtus, Biſhop of Marcianopolis, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 608, the decrees of which ſynod he is, as is ſaid, appointed to publiſh in Myſia. *p.* 660.

Piſtus, Prieſt of Mareotis, is excommunicated by the Council of Egypt with Arius, *p.* 10, whoſe letter to S. Alexander he ſigns, *p.* 23, is excommunicated by the Council of Nice, *p.* 630, receiv'd into the Communion of the Church by the Council of Jeruſalem in 335, *p.* 63, is always mention'd with horror by the Church, *p.* 70, is made Biſhop of the Arians of Alexandria in 339. *p.* 83.

Pithecians, a ſect of the Arians, why call'd by that name. *p.* 491.

Pitimus, an Egyptian Biſhop, baniſh'd in 373. *p.* 436.

Pittacus. See *Euſebius*.

Placcillus, Flaccillus, Flacitus, or Phanellus, is made Biſhop of Antioch in 333, *p.* 51, aſſiſts at the Council of Jeruſalem in 335, *p.* 58, and at that of Antioch in 341, *p.* 93, did not ſignalize himſelf very much among the Arians &c, *p.* 60, dies about 345. *p.* 60, 119.

Plinthas, an Arian, General under Theodoſius II, re-unites ſome of the Arian ſects &c. *p.* 491, 492, 593.

The *Pneumatomaci*, enemies to the Holy Ghoſt. *p.* 219. See the *Macedonians*.

Pœmenius, an Aëtian, is made Biſhop of Conſtantinople in oppoſition to Eudoxius. *p.* 339.

Pollux, Biſhop of Libya, is accus'd in the Council of Seleucia in 359. *p.* 290.

Polychalandæ, a city of Lydia. *p.* 290.

S. *Polychronius*, Prieſt and Martyr under Conſtantius. *p.* 91.

Polychronius, an Arian Biſhop, depos'd by the Council of Illyricum in 375. *p.* 445.

Pompeiopolis, a city of Paphlagonia. *p.* 287.

The *Pope*: the eccleſiaſtical law, ſays Socrates, forbids any ordinance or canon to be made without his conſent. *p.* 94. The Macedonians promiſe in 366 to ſubmit to the judgment of whatever Biſhop the Pope pleaſes, if they are accus'd of any thing for the future. *p.* 381. What ſynod Innocent I. ſays gives him the judgment of cauſes of importance. *p.* 686. The Council of Nice orders, that the Biſhop of Alexandria ſhould notify to the Pope the day on which Eaſter ſhould be obſerv'd, that he might give notice of it to the other Churches. *p.* 637. The extent of his immediate juriſdiction. *p.* 640, 641.

S. *Porphyry* is made Biſhop of Gaza in 395. *p.* 138.

Poſthumianus, Præfectus Prætorio of the Eaſt in 383. *p.* 482.

S. *Potamo*, Biſhop of Heraclea in Egypt, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 602.

Potamus of Lisbon has the greateſt hand in the perſecution of Liberius and Oſius. *p.* 185, 225. His prevarication and death. *p.* 225.

Prayers: The Council of Antioch orders penance to thoſe who refuſe to pray with the reſt. *p.* 101.

Prieſts: The Council of Illyricum in 375 gives them the title of Lord: *p.* 577: that of Antioch in 341 allows them the power of

of giving communicatory letters, *p.* 102, of looking into the administration of the goods of the Church, *p.* 105, forbids them to keep particular congregations. *p.* 102.

Priscus, Eunomius the arch-heretick's grandfather. *p.* 331.

Proclian, a Bishop, writes to the Church of Suedra. *p.* 443.

Proconnesus, an island in Propontis where there were some marble quarries. *p.* 433, 434.

Procopius revolts against Valens in 365 &c, *p.* 340, is defeated in 366. *p.* 372.

Protogenes, Bishop of Sardica, assists at the Council of Nice &c, *p.* 608, where he disputes, as is said, with a Philosopher, *p.* 653, and is appointed to publish the decrees of that synod in Calabria, *p.* 660, is anathematiz'd by the Eusebians, *p.* 123, 124.

Protogenes, Bishop of Mopsuestia. *p.* 568.

S. *Protogenes*, Bishop of Carræ; the history of him. *p.* 421--424.

Psathyrians, a sect of the Arians, why call'd by that name. *p.* 491.

Ptolemais, a city in the higher Libya or Pentapolis. *p.* 10.

Ptolemais, a city of Phœnicia. *p.* 603.

Ptolomy, Melitian Bishop of Thmuis, assists at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 290, and at that of Constantinople in 360. *p.* 313.

Q

Quimassus is defended by Hosius. *p.* 124.

Quintian is made Bishop of Gaza by the Arians in the room of Asclepas. *p.* 46.

Quintian: one of the Heads of the Eunomians &c. *p.* 350.

R

Radagaisus, an heathen Gothick prince. *p.* 464.

Readers subscribe for their Bishops in the Council of Seleucia in 359. *p.* 294.

S. *Reginus*, Bishop of Scopelos, martyr'd perhaps about 355. *p.* 90.

Re-ordination: The Melitians were not order'd by the Council of Nice to be re-ordain'd, but only to be receiv'd by imposition of hands. *p.* 678, 679.

S. *Restitutus*, Bishop of Carthage, assists at the Council of Ariminum in 359 &c *p.* 262, is sent a deputy to Constantius, *p.* 267, who makes him sign the Confession of Nicæ. *p.* 272.

Resurrection: a Church at Jerusalem call'd by that name dedicated in 335 &c. *p.* 58.

Rhesinia, an episcopal see in Mesopotamia. *p.* 603.

Rhinocurura or *Rhinocolura*, a considerable city of Egypt &c. *p.* 440.

S. *Rhodanus*, Bishop of Thoulouse, was not at the Council of Milan in 353, *p.* 159, is banish'd, not in 353 with S. Paulinus of Treves, *p.* 538, 539, but in 356, and dies in exile, *p.* 198, perhaps before the Council of Seleucia in 359. *p.* 288.

Rome. See the *Pope*. The troubles which are rais'd there by the persecution of Liberius, *p.* 183, and the ordination of Felix. *p.* 187, 188.

S. *Rufinian*, Bishop of Campania, dies in 355 by the hard usage of Epictetus &c. *p.* 195, 542.

Rufinus brings back some Macedonians to the Church about 380. *p.* 364.

S.

S

S. *Sabas*, Martyr of Gothia. *p.* 460.
S. *Sabinus*, Macedonian Biſhop of Heraclea, an unfaithful hiſtorian, *p.* 109, 375, 429, 430, perhaps ſucceeded Hypatian after the year 364, *p.* 375, makes a collection of the Councils, *p.* 289, 374.
Sadagolthinum, a village in Cappadocia near Parnaſſus. *p.* 457.
Saïs, an epiſcopal ſee in Egypt. *p.* 437.
Salamis, a city of Cyprus. *p.* 607.
Salona, a city of Dalmatia. *p.* 122.
Samoſata, a city of Syria. *p.* 603.
Sanctiſſimus carries in 373 or 376 a letter from S. Baſil to Abraham of Batnæ. *p.* 425.
Sapor, a General, puts the Catholicks into poſſeſſion of the Churches in 381. *p.* 475.
Saras. See *Seras*.
Sardica, a city of Dacia &c. *p.* 608.
Sarmates, Prieſt of Alexandria, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23. Theodorit is miſtaken in making him only a Deacon. *p.* 10.
Saturninus, a Novatian Biſhop, is receiv'd as a Biſhop into the Catholick Church. *p.* 650.
Saturninus of Arles, being excommunicatd in the Council of Biterræ in 356, *p.* 198, continues ſeparated from the communion of the Biſhops of France in 358. *p.* 237.
Saturninus, Count and Conſul in 383, carries Abraham Biſhop of Batnæ to his houſe in 372. *p.* 425.
Schedia, an epiſcopal ſee in Egypt. *p.* 602.
Scopelo, an iſland in the Archipelago, call'd Droma at preſent. *p.* 90.
Scripture: The Council of Nice probably did not put the book of Judith into the catalogue of the canonical books. *p.* 648.
Scythia, its principal towns, its eccleſiaſtical government, &c, *p.* 391, 392.
Scythopolis, a city of Paleſtine. *p.* 16.
Sebadius, a corrupt name for S. Phebadius Biſhop of Agen. *p.* 238.
Duke *Sebaſtian* brings George an Arian Biſhop to Alexandria in 356, *p.* 196, engages in the battle of Adrianople in which Valens dies in 378. *p.* 466.
Sebaſtopolis, a city of Pontus. *p.* 605.
Secundus of Teuchira, an Arian, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 612, 677.
Secundus, Biſhop of Ptolemaïs, a follower of Arius, is excommunicated with him by the Council of Egypt, *p.* 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander, *p.* 23, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice, *p.* 611, is anathematiz'd there, *p.* 630, 677, is receiv'd into the communion of the Church by the Council of Jeruſalem, *p.* 63, yet is always mention'd with horror by the Church, *p.* 70, ordains Piſtus Biſhop of Alexandria in 339, *p.* 10, 83, offers, as is ſaid, to make Aëtius a Biſhop &c, *p.* 215, ordains ſeveral other Arians. *p.* 290.
Selenas, Arian Biſhop of the Goths about 386 &c. *p.* 491.

Wild

Wild *Seleucia* or Seleucia of S. Thecla, the metropolis of Iſauria. *p.* 286, 450.
Seleucia, a city of Syria. *p.* 290.
The *Semiarians* were thoſe who acknowledg'd the Son to be like the Father, but not conſubſtantial with him. *p.* 218.
Sentianus, Arian Biſhop of Boræum, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 612.
Serapion, probably Deacon of Mareotis, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 11, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.
Seras, *Serras*, or Saras, Prieſt of Libya, a follower of Arius, *p.* 11, afterwards Biſhop of Parætonium, is baniſh'd in 358, *p.* 247, aſſiſts at the Council of Seleucia in 359 &c, *p.* 290, at the Council of Conſtantinople, *p.* 313, where he is excommunicated as an abettor of Aëtius, *p.* 315, whom he ordains Biſhop perhaps in 362. *p.* 215, 339.
S. *Servatius* of Tongres aſſiſts at the Council of Ariminum in 359, *p.* 262, where he ſuffers himſelf to be deceiv'd with the reſt. *p.* 275.
Severian, an African Biſhop, ſigns the anathema's of the Council of Ancyra at Sirmium in 358. *p.* 244.
Sichem, a city of Paleſtine, afterwards call'd Neapolis. *p.* 602.
Silvanus, Biſhop of Azotus in Paleſtine, receives S. Athanaſius there in 349. *p.* 602.
Silvanus of Tarſus aſſiſts in 351 at the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus, *p.* 143, receives S. Cyril of Jeruſalem after his depoſition &c, *p.* 236, is the cauſe that a general Council is not aſſembled at Tarſus in 358, *p.* 257, aſſiſts at that of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, propoſes there the confeſſion of the dedication of Antioch, *p.* 294, is ſent a deputy by that ſynod to Conſtantius, *p.* 300, whom he gets to make the Arians anathematize ſeveral blaſphemies &c, *p.* 304, ſigns the letter of the deputies of the Council of Seleucia to thoſe of Ariminum, *p.* 310, is depos'd by the Council of Conſtantinople in 360, *p.* 320, returns to the poſſeſſion of his Church in Julian's reign, *p.* 361, preſents a petition to Jovian, *p.* 366, is ſent a deputy to Liberius in 366, and ſigns the Nicene faith &c, *p.* 379 &c, dies probably in 373. *p.* 443.
S. *Silveſter*, Pope, ſends Vitus and Vincentius Prieſts of Rome to the Council of Nice, *p.* 153, 599, whither his age would not allow him to go. *p.* 599. The letter from this Council to him and his anſwer are ſpurious pieces. *p.* 658, 689.
Silveſter, a Biſhop of Dacia, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 608.
Singedunum in Phœnicia, a town unknown. *p.* 612.
Singedunum, a city of Myſia. *p.* 256.
Siſinnius, a Novatian Reader, appears, as is ſaid, at the conference of Conſtantinople in 383. *p.* 483.
Siſinnus is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 10, ſigns his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.
Smyrna, a city of the province of Aſia. *p.* 606.
Solomon or Salaminus, Biſhop of Germanicia, aſſiſts at the Council of Nice. *p.* 603.
Solon, Biſhop of Rhinocurura in Egypt, after the year 373. *p.* 440.
S. *Sophia*, a Church of Conſtantinople dedicated in 360, *p.* 324, burnt by the Arians perhaps in 388. *p.* 493.

Sophronius of Pompeiopolis, one of the heads of the Semiarians, *p.* 220, assists at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, rejects there the confession presented by the Acacians, *p.* 296, signs the letter to the deputies of Ariminum, *p.* 310, is depos'd by the Council of Constantinople in 360. *p.* 320. Macedonius writes to him. *p.* 322. He is restor'd, and is present at several Councils of the Semiarians, *p.* 362, presents a petition to Jovian. *p.* 366.

Sophronius refutes Eunomius's answer to S. Basil. *p.* 346.

Sopolus, a famous physician at Alexandria about 350. *p.* 210.

Sotades, an infamous poet of Egypt, imitated by Arius. *p.* 23.

Sozusa, a city in Libya. *p.* 313.

S. *Spiridio*, Bishop of Tremithus, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.*607. The conversion of a philosopher is ascrib'd to him. *p.* 653.

Stephen: S. Eustathius of Antioch refuses to receive him into his Clergy. *p.* 45. He is made Bishop of Antioch by the Eusebians, *p.* 52, probably in 345, *p.* 119, is depos'd by the Council of Sardica in 347, *p.* 121, presides at the Council of Philippopolis, *ibid*, is depos'd by the Eusebians in 348, and banish'd till 362, *p.* 131.

Stephen of Ptolemaïs in Libya assists at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 290, at that of Constantinople in 360, *p.* 313, where he is excommunicated as an abettor of Aëtius. *p.* 315, 316.

Strategius. See *Musonianus.*

Subscription: The great disturbances which were caus'd by signing the confession of Ariminum. *p.* 328. Those who sign'd it through ignorance, were not innocent, tho' less faulty. *p.* 329.

Suedra, a city in Pamphylia. *p.* 443.

Sunday: the Council of Nice orders people to pray standing on Sundays. *p.* 645.

Sympius or *Symposius*, Bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, embraces S. Basil's communion in 375. *p.* 450.

Synclitius, a publick courier, carries Constantine's letter to Arius to Alexandria. *p.* 32.

Syria alters its practice in celebrating Easter after the Council of Nice. *p.* 636.

Syrianus, Duke of Egypt, turns S. Athanasius out of Alexandria in 356. *p.* 196.

T

Tabia, a city of Galatia. *p.* 606.

Tarcondimatus, Arian Bishop of Ægæ in Cilicia, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 612.

Tarsus, the metropolis of Cilicia. *p.* 603.

Tascodrugites, hereticks: Theodosius in 383 forbids them to hold any assembly. *p.* 488.

Tatian, Prefect of Egypt the second time in 373, continues the persecution there against the Catholicks. *p.* 439.

Taurus assists at the dispute between Basil and Photinus in 351, *p.* 146, and at the Council of Ariminum in 359 &c, *p.* 263, where he keeps the Bishops till they had subscrib'd to heresy. *p.* 272.

Telemachus, an Arian Bishop, depos'd in the Council of Illyricum in 375. *p.* 445.

Teuchira, an episcopal see in Libya. *p* 612.

Thalassius assists at the dispute between Basil and Photinus in 351. *p.* 146.

Thalia, an impious book of Arius's writing, in imitation of an infamous poet. *p.* 23.

Themistius softens, as is said, Valens's cruelty against the Catholicks by a discourse in 372. *p.* 412.
Themisus, a city of Phrygia. *p.* 290.
Theo, Priest of Jerusalem about 372. *p.* 426.
Theoctistus, a cake-maker, gives a name to a sect of the Arians. *p.* 491.
Theodorus. See *Dorotheus*.
Theodorus of Vasagada assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 607.
Theodorus of Sidon assists at the Council of Nice, *p.* 612.
Theodorus of Tarsus, assists, as is said, at the Council of Nice, *p.* 603, chooses Eusebius of Cæsarea for the bishoprick of Antioch in 332. *p.* 49.
Theodorus of Heraclea was not probably at the Council of Nice, *p.* 612, 613, assists at that of Jerusalem in 335, *p.* 58, continues to slander the Saints in Constantius's reign, *p.* 80, assists in 341 at the Council of Antioch, *p.* 93, makes Macedonius Bishop of Constantinople after Eusebius's death, *p.* 108, is sent on a deputation to Constans in 342, *p.* 111, is depos'd by the Council of Sardica in 347, *p.* 121, assists at the Council of Sirmium against Photinus in 351, *p.* 143, dies in 355 &c. *p.* 189, 541, 542. His learning, his works, his style &c. *p.* 61.
S. *Theodorus* or Theodulus, one of the eighty Ecclesiasticks of Constantinople martyr'd in 370. *p.* 398.
Theodorus of Mopsuestia refutes Eunomius's answer to S. Basil. *p.* 346.
Theodosius, an Arian: S. Eustathius refuses to receive him into the Clergy of Antioch. *p.* 45. The Arians make him Bishop of Tripolis in Phœnicia. *p.* 52, 89.
Theodosius of Philadelphia in Lydia assists at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 289, where he is depos'd, *p.* 299, is present at that of Constantinople in 360, *p.* 313, and is excommunicated there as an abettor of Aëtius. *p.* 316, 584.
Theodosius is made Emperor upon the 19th of January 379, *p.* 471, is baptiz'd in 380 by Ascolius of Thessalonica, *p.* 473, makes several laws in favour of the Church, *p.* 473--475, banishes Eunomius and the Eunomians, *p.* 342, expells Lucius of Alexandria, *p.* 465, sets up a statue of Arius at the place of his infamous death, *p.* 75, assembles, as is said, the heads of the sects in 383 to unite them to the Church, *p.* 481--484, forbids the hereticks to hold any congregation, *p.* 487, lays a fine of ten pounds of gold in 392 upon all the heretical Clergy. *p.* 493.
Theodotus of Laodicea in Syria, a follower of Arius, *p.* 16, 499--501, whom he equals in impiety, *p.* 26, in which he always persisted, *p.* 500, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 611. Constantine writes to him to persuade him to leave his errors. *p.* 37. He assists in 331 at the deposition of S. Eustathius of Antioch, *p.* 45, and chooses Eusebius of Cæsarea for his successor. *p.* 49.
Theodotus, Bishop of Berea: S. Basil writes to him in 372. *p.* 415.
Theodotus, Bishop of Laodicea, under whom was held, as is said, the Council of Laodicea &c. *p.* 450.
Theodotus, Bishop of Nicopolis, dies about 376. *p.* 453.
Theodulus, Bishop of Trajanople, is persecuted by the Arians about 340, *p.* 89, 90, and about 347. *p.* 128. It is thought that he was dead before the Council of Sardica &c. *p.* 517, 518.
Theodulus, one of the Emperor's notaries, writes down the dispute between Basil and Photinus. *p.* 146.

Theodulus of Chæretapa in Phrygia assists at the Council of Seleucia in 359, *p.*287, where he is accus'd, *p.*289, and depos'd, *p.*299, comes to the Council of Constantinople in 360, *p.*313, and is excommunicated there as an abettor of Aëtius, *p.*316, whom he makes Bishop perhaps in 362. *p.*289, 339.

Theognis of Nice was, as is said, disciple to S. Lucius of Antioch, *p.* 19, assists at the Council of Nice, *p.*611, was a partisan of Arius, *p.*16, persists in his errors after the Council, *p.* 34, receives some Arians who were condemn'd, *p.* 35, is depos'd and banish'd, *p.*35, 36, 503--505, is recall'd in 328 or 329. *p.* 38. His petition or palinodia is a spurious piece. *p.*672 --675. He assists at the deposition of S. Eustathius in 331, *p.* 45, and at the Council of Jerusalem in 335, *p.* 58, comes to Constantinople to oppose S. Athanasius, *p.* 65, continues to slander the Saints in Constantius's reign, *p.* 80, makes Macedonius Bishop of Constantinople after Eusebius's death, *p.* 108, dies probably before 347. *p.* 117.

Theonas, Bishop of Marmarica, an Arian, is excommunicated by the Council of Egypt, *p.* 10, signs Arius's letter to S. Alexander, *p.* 23, assists at the Council of Nice, *p.*611, where he is condemn'd. *p.* 631.

Theonas, Bishop of Cyzicus, assists at the Council of Nice, *p.*191, 606, is appointed, as is said, to publish the decrees of that synod in Asia minor. *p.* 660.

Theophilus, Bishop of Scythia, assists at the Council of Nice, &c. *p.* 609.

Theophilus Blemmyensis introduces Aëtius to Gallus, *p.*214, is banish'd to Heraclea in Pontus in 358, *p.*247, assists at the Council of Constantinople in 360, *p.*313, where he is excommunicated as an abettor of Aëtius, *p.*316, whom he ordains Bishop perhaps in 362 &c, *p.*339, fixes himself at Antioch in opposition to Euzoïus in 363. *ibid.*

Theophilus, elected Bishop of Eleutheropolis, is made Bishop of Castabala in Cilicia &c, *p.* 320, presents a petition to Jovian, *p.* 366, is sent on a deputation to Liberius, signs the Council of Nice in 366, &c. *p.*379, &c.

Theophilus of Alexandria deposes and banishes Paul a Bishop and Confessor. *p.* 439.

Theophronius of Tyanæ in Cappadocia assists at the Council of Antioch in 341, *p.*94, draws up there a third creed. *p.* 100.

Theophronius, Bishop of Cappadocia, separates from Eunomius, and innovates in baptism. *p.* 348.

Theosebius is made Bishop of Sardis in 360. *p.* 327.

Thespesius an orator, teaches at Cæsarea in Palestine about 360. *p.* 426.

Thmuis, a city in Egypt, &c. *p.* 602.

Thrace, infected by the Arians, *p.* 360, 361, and the Macedonians. *p.* 364.

Timothy, Bishop of Alexandria from 381 to 385, &c. *p.*478, 591.

Tomi, the metropolis of Scythia, and the place of the Bishop's residence. *p.* 392.

Trajan, a General takes care of S. Zeugmatius an hermit. *p.* 416.

Trajanople, a city of Thrace. *p.* 90.

Treves, the metropolitical Church of Gaul. *p.* 154.

Tripolis, cities in Phœnicia, Libya, and Lydia. *p.* 16, 89, 289, 603.

Troas, a city in the province of Asia. *p.* 606.

Troglites or *Troglodytes*, names for the pure Arians. *p.* 218.

Tyanæ, a city in Cappadocia. *p.* 94, 387.

Tyrannus, Bishop of Antinoë in Thebais, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 602.

V

Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum, young Bishops as wicked as they were ignorant, *p.* 61, assist at the Council of Jerusalem in 335, *p.* 58, go to Constantine to oppose S. Athanasius, *p.* 65, make Macedonius Bishop of Constantinople after Eusebius's death. *p.* 108. Valens endea-

endeavours, but in vain, to usurp the see of Aquilea in 344. *p.* 117. They are depos'd by the Council of Sardica in 347, *p.* 121, present a petition to the Council of Milan &c, *p.* 130, retract in 349 all that they had publickly reported against S. Athanasius, *p.* 138, retract their retractation. *p.* 141. Valens imposes upon Constantius upon the occasion of the battle of Mursa. *p.* 142. They assist at the Council of Sirmium against Photinus in 351, *p.* 143, commit violences at Sirmium, *p.* 149, get S. Athanasius condemn'd at Arles in 353 &c, *p.* 153, cause Hilary Deacon of Rome to be scourg'd at Milan in 355, *p.* 158, send their Ecclesiasticks to execute Constantius's orders for persecuting the Catholicks, *p.* 163, are excommunicated in the Council of Biterræ in 356, *p.* 198, are present at the drawing up of the second confession of Sirmium, *p.* 226, to which they add a more open impiety. *p.* 227, 237. Liberius writes to them after having sign'd. *p.* 229. The Council of Antioch congratulates them upon their success in the propagation of heresy. *p.* 240. They are oblig'd in 358 to sign the anathema's of the Council of Ancyra at Sirmium. *p.* 244. Basil writes against them into Africa, where they are condemn'd. *p.* 246. They cause the General Council in 359 to be divided into two, *p.* 255, are present at the third confession of Sirmium in 359, *p.* 259, propose it at the Council of Ariminum, *p.* 264, and are depos'd there, *p.* 266, prepossess Constantius in their favour, *p.* 268, are restor'd by that Council, *p.* 272, 274, impose upon S. Phebadius, &c. *p.* 275. Valens pronounces publickly in that synod several anathema's. *p.* 277. They are deputed to Constantius by the prevaricators, *p.* 278, publish their victory over this Council, *p.* 279, after which they have, as is said, full power to do what they please in behalf of heresy. *p.* 284. The Semiarians depos'd at Constantinople in 360, write against them. *p.* 322, 323. Valens obtains that Eunomius may be recall'd perhaps in 368. *p.* 341, 393. The Macedonians require of Liberius in 366 that Valens and Ursacius should be look'd on as excommunicates, &c. *p.* 379. They write to Germinius in 366 upon his changing his principles, *p.* 386, are excommunicated in 369 by the Council of Rome, Spain, and Gaul, *p.* 393, were probably dead in 375. *p.* 445.

Valens is made Emperor in 364, *p.* 340, is seduc'd by his wife, *p.* 368, might possibly banish and recall S. Meletius in 365, *p.* 372, allows the Macedonians to hold a Council, *p.* 370, advises them to agree with Eudoxius, *p.* 373, is angry with them and banishes them in 366, *ibid*, makes Eleusius submit to the Arian Council of Nicomedia, *p.* 374, raises a great persecution in 367. *p.* 389, 390. A general description of that persecution. *p.* 400---405. He is baptiz'd by Eudoxius, *p.* 368, 391, resides at Marcianople in 367, 368, and 369, *p.* 340, attacks S. Bretanio Bishop of Scythia in vain in 368. *p.* 391---393. The death of Eudoxius stops him at Nicomedia in 370. *p.* 395. He banishes S. Evagrius who was chosen Bishop in his place, *p.* 396, causes 80 Ecclesiasticks of Constantinople to be kill'd &c, *p.* 397, goes from Constantinople to Cæsarea, and persecutes the Catholicks every where in 371 and 372 &c, *p.* 405---408, sends Lucius to Alexandria in 372 &c, *p.* 431, is oblig'd to publish Valentinian's edict for the Catholicks in 375, *p.* 448, persecutes the monks in 376, *p.* 455, 456, engages the Goths in Arianism in 377, *p.* 461, is burnt by them in 378 &c, *p.* 466, not having probably recall'd the Confessors. *p.* 588.

Valentinian I. is made Emperor in 364, does not shew zeal enough for the Catholick faith &c, *p.* 367, confirms to Nice the title and honours of a metropolis, *p.* 597. The Macedonians send a deputation to him in

366 &c. *p.* 379. He turns Photinus out of Sirmium, *p.* 147, causes a Council to be held in Illyricum in 375 &c, *p.* 445, authorizes it by his letters, and makes an edict in favour of the Catholicks, *p.* 447, 448, dies upon the 17th of November 375. *p.* 448, 449.

Valentinian, Valens's son, dies in 372, baptiz'd by the Arians. *p.* 407.

Valerius. See *Eulalius*.

The *Vandals* receive Arianism from the Goths. *p.* 462.

Vasagada, a city of Isauria. *p.* 607.

Venerius, a Commissary, removes from Liberius Urbicus his Deacon. *p.* 227.

Viator, a Bishop, dies at Aquilea in 344 &c. *p.* 117.

Marius *Victorinus*, an African, profes's'd eloquence at Rome in 357, *p.* 223, writes against Candidus an Eunomian. *p.* 340.

Vincentius, Priest of Rome, S. Silvester's legate to the Council of Nice, *p.* 599, the decrees of which synod he is appointed, as is said, to publish at Rome, in Italy &c. *p.* 659. It is thought that he is the same with *Vincentius* Bishop of Capua, *p.* 153, who was sent in 348 by Constans and the Chuncil of Sardica to Constantius &c, *p.* 131, 136, gave up S. Athanasius in the Council of Arles in 353 &c. *p.* 153. Liberius writes to him after his fall. *p.* 229. He refuses to consent to the decrees of Ariminum in 359. *p.* 283.

Vitus, *Vito*, or Victor, Priest and legate from S. Silvester at the Council of Nice. *p.* 599, 659.

Vitus, Bishop of Carræ, assists in 381 at the Council of Constantinople. *p.* 424.

Ulphilas, Bishop of the Goths: the history of him. *p.* 457---464. He assists in 360 at the Council of Constantinople, *p.* 314, did not embrace Arianism till about 376. *p.* 586, 587.

Unilas, Bishop of the Goths, dies in 404. *p.* 463.

Uranius of Tyre is present at the Council of Antioch in 358 &c, *p.* 240, at that of Seleucia in 359, *p.* 287, where he is accus'd, *p.* 289, and depos'd, *p.* 299, and at that of the Council of Constantinople in 360. *p.* 313.

Uranius of Melitene assists at the Council of Antioch in 365. *p.* 388.

Urbanus or *Urbasus*, one of the 80 Ecclesiasticks of Constantinople, martyr'd in 370. *p.* 398.

Urbicus, Deacon of Rome, is remov'd from Liberius in his banishment. *p.* 227.

Ursacius, Bishop of Singidunum. See *Valens* of Mursa.

Ustodizo. See *Nicæ*.

W

THE *Word*: The Arians allow'd a Word in God different from Jesus Christ. *p.* 6. Photinus's principles concerning the Word. *p.* 115, 116, 528, 529.

Z

POpe *Zachary* rebuilds the Church of S. Eusebius the Martyr. *p.* 252.

Zela, a city in Pontus. *p.* 362.

Zena or *Zenopolis*, a city of Lycia. *p.* 366.

Zeno of Tyre assists in 367 at the Council of Tyanæ. *p.* 388.

Zeugma, an episcopal see in Syria. *p.* 603.

S. *Zeugmatius*, an hermit, maintains the faith in opposition to the Arians in Valens's reign &c. *p.* 416.

Zoïs, a Novatian Bishop, is receiv'd as a Bishop by the Catholick Church. *p.* 650.

Zopyrus of Barca, an Arian, assists at the Council of Nice. *p.* 612.

Zosimus, perhaps Deacon of Mareotis, is excommunicated with Arius, *p.* 11, signs his letter to S. Alexander. *p.* 23.

Zosimus, Bishop of Mopsuestia. *p.* 568.

Zozimus does penance for his intrusion into the bishoprick of Naples in 355 &c. *p.* 194.

FINIS.

MVSEVM BRITAN NICVM

uſes a
by his
448,
07.

p.227.

.223,

ice, p.
pub-
ſame
Con-
ve up
writes
ees of

cil of

.424.
aſſiſts
ce A-

. 240,
d de-
. 313.
mar-

p.227.

Jeſus
116,
2.

Arians

holick

ius, p.

les in

